

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE LAMONT-LODGE LETTERS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Corliss Lamont has long been one of our Nation's most principled and articulate voices on questions of public and foreign policy. If his warnings of the emerging folly of our Vietnam policy had been heeded in time, thousands of lives might have been saved and untold suffering avoided.

An exchange of letters between Corliss Lamont and Henry Cabot Lodge, who served as Ambassador to South Vietnam, has now been published in Harvard Magazine. The correspondence begins with Corliss Lamont's open letter to Lodge dated November 1, 1965, and concludes with Lodge's revealing note of August 2, 1984. This material is of special relevance as we again consider proposals to escalate U.S. military involvement in the Third World. I commend the text of these letters to the attention of all Members of the House.

THE LAMONT-LODGE LETTERS

Corliss Lamont and the late Henry Cabot Lodge were classmates and close friends, but throughout the course of a long-running correspondence they were fierce political adversaries. The Vietnam war brought the two into opposition once more, resulting in a series of public and private documents that deserve a place in the historical record of the Vietnam era.

In November 1965, when Lodge was in his second tour as U.S. Ambassador in Saigon, Lamont wrote a long open letter reproving him for supporting a militarily imposed solution to the crisis in Vietnam. Lodge tenaciously defended the Johnson administration's position in a communication that the New York World Journal Tribune published in September 1966. Lamont replied in a second open letter. Lodge did not respond, but long afterward, in the summer of 1984, he wrote Lamont a brief and compelling note resolving their disagreement.

Lamont's first open letter is reprinted below in slightly shortened form; Lodge's newspaper statement appears in full.

LAMONT TO LODGE

Dear Cabot: You will recall that as classmates in the great Harvard Class of 1924, we both helped to found the Harvard Debating Union, and that you and I had brisk exchanges at its meetings. Ever since, we have carried on a running debate concerning basic issues that have confronted our country and the world. You consistently maintained a conservative position, and before long became a prominent member of the Republican Party. In my judgment you were always one of the better Republicans.

Now our disagreement has become more far-reaching and fundamental than ever because of your active support, as American Ambassador to South Vietnam, of the Johnson Administration's cruel, illegal and immoral war of aggression in Vietnam. Fur-

thermore, you were willing to become Ambassador a second time precisely when Marshal Ky, the new Premier of the South Vietnamese Government, had proclaimed that his great hero was Adolf Hitler.

Like Secretary Rusk and the U.S. State Department, you have pretended that South Vietnam was established as a permanent independent state in the Geneva Accords of 1954, whereas you well know that the division of Vietnam into South Vietnam and North Vietnam was designed as a temporary measure and that the Accords provided for all Vietnam elections in 1956 to unify the country. You must be aware, too, that it was the United States and its puppet, President Diem of South Vietnam, that refused to permit these elections and thus clearly violated the Geneva treaty.

As Walter Lippmann has pointed out: "While our government endorsed the Geneva agreements, and especially the provision for free elections, it opposed free elections when it realized that Ho Chi Minh (President of North Vietnam) would win them. Gen. Eisenhower states this frankly in his memoirs. Since that time, we have insisted that South Vietnam is an independent nation." (New York Herald Tribune, April 20, 1965). What all of this adds up to is that in this matter the United States has been guilty of double-dealing and a failure to honor its pledged word.

The inscription on the seal of Harvard is *Veritas*, a motto that has deep meaning for Harvard men. Do you really think, Cabot, that you are serving Truth when you join in distorting the meaning and history of the Geneva Accords that are so basic to understanding the situation in Vietnam?

Again, every objective observer knows that the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, with its military arm—the so-called Vietcong—is leading a nationalist uprising supported by the vast majority of the population. The fact that Communists strongly back this revolution and share in its leadership does not nullify its indigenous character. What we have here is the resolute and unyielding effort of a former colonial people to assert its freedom. Opposing this is a white Western nation, the U.S.A., determined to re-impose shackles such as France maintained for almost a century. As the noted British historian Arnold Toynbee tells us, the Vietcong struggle is part of a world-wide "revolt of the 'native' majority of mankind against the domination of the Western minority."

The Vietcong guerrillas possess effective modern weapons in considerable quantity, but only a trickle of arms reached them from North Vietnam (at least up to February 1965). It is the United States that has been the main source of supply. For the guerrillas have obtained their guns chiefly from deserters bringing in American-made arms or by capturing such arms from the apathetic troops of the South Vietnamese Government.

In spite of these well-recognized facts, the U.S. Government last February, when it realized the Vietcong was winning the civil war, suddenly started intensive bombing of Communist North Vietnam on the specious

ground that that country all along had been invading South Vietnam and bore the major responsibility for the troubles there. Johnson and his military advisors invented this line in order to justify their own savage aggression against North Vietnam.

This crass propaganda issuing from the White House you, Cabot Lodge, have supported all the way in public statements. In your heart of hearts, can you possibly think that this is *Veritas*? U Thant of the United Nations was right when he said in reference to Vietnam: "In times of war and of hostilities, the first casualty is truth."

You have also misled your fellow Americans by claiming that the U.S. Government's purpose in Vietnam is to save freedom and establish democracy. In fact, starting with the brutal dictator Diem, the United States has bolstered up one puppet dictatorship after another in Saigon—nine different governments in the past two years—as successive military coups have taken place. These South Vietnamese governments rule through police-state methods of crude violence, terror and torture. None of them would have lasted a week without the military support of the United States.

In all frankness, Cabot, how can you sleep nights when you sanction the horrible and wholesale slaughter by U.S. bombers of women, children and peasants—on noncombatant civilians in general—throughout Vietnam? In the past few months, American planes have repeatedly dropped napalm and heavy-duty bombs indiscriminately on South Vietnam villages where a few Vietcong were "reported" to be. Here is what a U.S. Air Force officer recently told the Associated Press: "When we are in a bind, we unload on the whole area in order to save the situation. We usually kill more women and children than we do Vietcong." In North Vietnam, our bombers have destroyed hospitals and patients, schools and school children, residential houses and civilians. Owing to the terrific bombings in South Vietnam, more than 600,000 destitute refugees have fled to the coastal cities.

You are among those responsible not only for the killing of scores of thousands of Vietnamese, but also for the death of more than 1,000 American soldiers who have resolutely given up their lives in this futile, useless war 10,000 miles from our Pacific Coast—a madcap adventure in which the United States has already wasted billions of dollars collected from American taxpayers. The probabilities are all against our winning this conflict, even if our trigger-happy President sends 1,000,000 troops to Vietnam. We cannot win because of the jungle terrain, because the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese people is opposed to the U.S. intervention and because no stable, effective government can be established in Saigon.

Yet the United States buildup increases at a rapid rate. On June 30, 1964, a well-known U.S. diplomat was asked what he thought would be the consequences of massive American involvement in Vietnam. His answer was:

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Well, that means we become a colonial power and I think it's been pretty well established that colonialism is over. I believe if you start doing that you will get all kinds of unfortunate results: you'll stir up anti-foreign feeling; there'll be a tendency to lay back and let the Americans do it and all that. I can't think that it's a good thing to do.

My dear classmate, do you know who said that? Why, it was none other than the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, then serving his first term as Ambassador to South Vietnam. So now that long-suffering country is, as implied by your own words, fast becoming a U.S. colony. Are you hoping soon to become Governor of the fifty-first American State—South Vietnam?

Please consider carefully that if the President keeps on escalating this Vietnam conflict and grabbing more and more Asian real estate, the Soviet Union and Communist China will surely react with far more effective countermeasures than they have used hitherto. Herein lies a terrible danger. For continuing escalation could finally erupt into the Great Nuclear War that would bring untold devastation to the U.S.A. and many other countries. Johnson and you, Cabot, are gambling with the survival of our Nation and of the human race itself.

Addressing you now as a former Senator, there is a special point I want to make: As a member of the U.S. Senate for many years, you ought to be much concerned with the prerogatives and powers of that august body as set forth in the American Constitution. Today, President Johnson is usurping the functions of both the Senate and the House of Representatives by taking this country into a *de facto* war in Vietnam and thus bypassing the Constitution's pronouncement in Article I, Section 8, that Congress alone has the power to declare and make war.

You, as an ex-Senator, should be one of the first to protest against the President's dictatorial flouting of the Constitution—an obvious illegality that is contributing towards the breakdown of democratic government in the United States.

I should think that you, Cabot, as a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations pledged to uphold its Charter and international law in general, could not but suffer many qualms of conscience in upholding the President's current foreign policy. For the Administration's brutal course of action in Vietnam flagrantly violates the Charter of the United Nations, the Geneva Accords of 1954, the principles laid down at the Nuremberg Trials of Nazi war criminals, and the 1949 Geneva Convention of the International Red Cross dealing with the "rules of war."

As a member of the United States diplomatic corps, you cannot be unaware that President Johnson's Vietnam venture has seriously set back American influence and prestige virtually everywhere in the world. Even America's own allies are really appalled. On the shelf for the duration are the pressing tasks of working out disarmament agreements regarding both nuclear and conventional weapons. And in general, to cite Walter Lippmann again, "The war in Vietnam is blocking the progress of the nations, including that of Red China itself, towards the peaceable coexistence and accommodation which is the predominant need of all peoples." (New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 12, 1965.)

The way out of the Vietnam mess is clear. There must be a cessation of U.S. bombing in all of Vietnam and a general cease-fire; a

peace conference that includes the National Liberation Front as an independent authority in its own right, and the various nations directly involved; and a settlement that returns to the original Geneva Accords. This would mean the complete withdrawal of the U.S. Army and all other foreign troops from South Vietnam; a guarantee against any foreign military bases in that country; and elections to enable the Vietnamese people freely to choose their own government in accordance with the long-established principles of self-determination.

It is often said that America would lose face if it gets out of Vietnam without winning a clear-cut victory. But the United States has already lost so much face because of its barbaric conduct in Vietnam that this argument has little merit. In all truth, our country would gain great prestige by retiring from Vietnam, just as did France and President de Gaulle when they finally agreed to Algeria's independence. . . .

In conclusion, then, I urge you, Cabot Lodge, to stop abetting President Johnson's evil actions and designs in Vietnam. It would be an enormous pity at this advanced stage of your career for you to fatally tarnish your reputation by qualifying as a leading War Hawk. Resign your ambassadorship and rebuild your public image before it is too late! The highest patriotism is not militaristic; it is to strive for justice and peace and that international amity which is the best assurance for America's national security. Come home and help transform the Republican Party into the great American Peace Party, opposed to U.S. military intervention in Asia, Latin America, or anywhere else. On that platform you and the Republicans might well win another election.

CORLISS LAMONT

November 1, 1965.

LODGE ON VIETNAM

This may be an appropriate time to summarize why the suppression of aggression in Vietnam is important—especially so important as to justify the present active involvement of the United States.

To give a brief answer to a big question, I submit, first, that to suppress aggression is morally right since the suppression of aggression has a high priority on the list of the purposes of the United Nations which are embodied in its charter. And the United Nations Charter is the most widely adhered to code of behavior for nations.

Then, to the United Nations Charter should be added the Southeast Asia Treaty and the numerous acts by Congress on the subject which give our involvement in Vietnam not only a moral but a legal base.

Finally, our involvement is a matter of prudence and wisdom, sagacity and self-defense.

If the Communist aggression against Vietnam were to be successful and we were to be expelled and they were to seize the country, a situation of danger would be created which could scarcely be exaggerated and which would make our present situation seem as safe as a church.

No one recognizes this more than the leaders of the other Asian countries. They know if Vietnam goes under, the repercussions would soon come in Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Taiwan. History shows that aggression feeds on itself and that one aggression encourages another.

Do we want to wait until the aggression is lapping at the shores of Japan and Australia, bringing on the worldwide holocaust which a threat to these countries would involve?

Clearly such a defeat would shake confidence in us not only in Asia, but also in the Atlantic community. It would thus endanger peace everywhere.

Clearly, the United States is not trying to be policeman for the whole world. We are not making our stand on the peaks of the Himalayan Mountains. But neither should we wait to defend our country until the enemy is either on the sands of Waikiki Beach or on the sands of Cape Cod.

For this great Vietnamese sweep of coast, with one of the greatest food producing areas of the world at its southern end, to fall to the aggressor would be a direct threat to our security in this shrunken world.

If you look at the map, you can see this country is in the middle of Southeast Asia—a sort of strategic keystone. What happens to it affects all of Southeast Asia. But it also has a direct and vital effect on us.

The American fighting man who is here is quite simply and plainly fighting for his country.

HENRY CABOT LODGE,

U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, September 13, 1966.

LAMONT TO LODGE

"Your letter to the World Journal Tribune attempts to bamboozle the readers of that newspaper by omitting any mention of the Geneva Accords of 1954," wrote Lamont in his second open letter to Lodge, dated October 6, 1966. "The aim is to attempt the frameup of a whole country, to mislead the American people into believing that North Vietnam is the aggressor instead of the power-mad big bully—the United States of America."

Lamont reiterated some of the points he had made in his first open letter, but rhetorically he went further, addressing his old friend as "Mr. Major General" [Lodge's rank in the Army Reserve], "General Lodge," and "Proconsul Lodge (as they call you in Europe)." In modern times, he asserted,

... Many ambassadors have been mere messenger boys for their governments. But as Ambassador to South Vietnam you have been much more than that. . . . Utilizing your own special study of counter insurgency as taught by the U.S. Army, you have helped plan military strategy. You have advised American generals on how to combat the Vietcong, and Vietnamese generals on how to stage coups to install new U.S. stooges.

Since his previous letter, Lamont noted, the U.S. had raised its commitment of troops in Vietnam from 150,000 to 315,000, and

... no matter how many soldiers Johnson pours into Vietnam and how much of our treasure he spends for the killing of Vietnamese, the United States can never win this war. The Pentagon estimates that in a guerrilla operation of this kind the United States must have for victory a ratio of 10 to 1 against the enemy. Even if Johnson sends over 1,000,000 men, it is not too difficult for the Vietcong and North Vietnamese to provide 200,000 additional fighters to match them in the jungle terrain. And if the U.S. raises the ante to 2,000,000, then China will come in and easily marshal 400,000 men. . . . What we are doing in Vietnam is to sink deeper and deeper into the worst military trap in our history.

You, General Lodge, are caught in this same trap and are throwing your reputa-

tion, earned in peaceful and useful public service, down the drain. . . .

In closing, Lamont added:
It is possible that eventually our correspondence may prove to have some historic importance. And I am confident that in judging between us, history and the conscience of America will find you to have been terribly wrong about Vietnam.

LODGE TO LAMONT

In the spring of 1967 Lodge resigned as ambassador to Vietnam. Subsequently he served as ambassador-at-large, ambassador to Germany, chief negotiator at the 1969 Paris peace talks, and special envoy to the Vatican.

In the summer of 1984 he wrote for the last time to Lamont, who had sent him a copy of his autobiography. Reconciling an unsettled account that was almost two decades old, Lodge went straight to the point.

Dear Corliss, regarding your open letter of November 1, 1965 concerning me. You were right. We were wrong and we failed. I should have resigned sooner.

Thank you for your most interesting book which I am reading with avidity.

Best wishes always,

CABOT

August 2

Lodge died on February 27, 1985. His forty-year record of public service had included three terms in the Senate, seven years as U.S. delegate to the United Nations, and the Republican vice presidential nomination in 1960.

Lamont, a self-styled "moderate radical," continues to write and lecture. A New Yorker, he is chairman of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. Recently he endowed an annual lecture at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, to be given by a person "widely recognized for leadership in diminishing the risk of nuclear war."

TRIBUTE TO REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, January 20 marked the first Federal observance of the birthday of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., a holiday established to celebrate his life and his beliefs. I want to express my complete support for this holiday. It gives us time to remember the work that Reverend King began and the dreams that he instilled in all Americans.

Reverend King dedicated his life to working for the freedom of all humankind. He called on each and every one of us to seek social justice and economic opportunity. He led boycotts, sit-ins, demonstrations, and other peaceful forms of protest. Despite the fact that he was often met with firehoses, tear gas, and prison sentences, Reverend King continued undaunted and undeterred.

Although much work still remains to be done to fulfill his dream for us, Reverend King influenced numerous civil rights victories. In 1955, he led a boycott of the Montgomery bus system in Alabama because of their discriminatory policies. A year later, the city of Montgomery declared an end to racial segregation

on the buses. This was one of his first victories. He later witnessed the signing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which eliminated "white only" signs from public places and guaranteed equal job and educational opportunities for all. In 1965, he was on hand to watch President Johnson sign the Voting Rights Act, which made it illegal to ask for literacy tests and other voting restrictions which had effectively prevented thousands of blacks from voting.

But, perhaps more than anything else, the life of Rev. Martin L. King demonstrated that it was possible for people of different races and backgrounds to work together peacefully to achieve social and economic progress. He gave his life to the advancement of humankind. The best tribute we can pay to him and his life is to answer that call.

MANY ACHIEVEMENTS OF GRANT TINKER

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished career of Mr. Grant Tinker, chairman of the board and the chief executive officer of the National Broadcasting Co.

From his work as the head of the prestigious production company, MTM Enterprises, to his extremely influential role as NBC's chief executive, Mr. Tinker has made outstanding contributions to the world of network television, and thus has helped to enrich the lives of millions of Americans. I salute Mr. Tinker for his continual efforts at improving the face of commercial television.

His many achievements are highlighted in an article from the October 20, 1985, Boston Globe Magazine. I would like to share some excerpts from this article with my colleagues:

TINKER'S A-PLUS TEAM

(By Ed Siegel)

He is, he wants you to know, a tinker. The poster over his desk with the dictionary entry even spells it out: "tinker, n. an unskillful or clumsy worker; a bungler."

He is not, he wants you to know, the phoney Grant Tinker who comes on Late Night with David Letterman to hawk RCA stereo television sets or give guided tours of the NBC commissary.

To anyone who knows him—or has even just met him—he is neither of those Tinkers, the Webster's bungler nor the corpulent caricature who cheapskates his way across the Letterman landscape.

The real Grant Tinker is the elegantly dressed, athletically trim, and gracefully articulate 59-year-old chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Company, who, first as head of the prestigious production company MTM Enterprises and now as chief executive officer of NBC, may have done more than any other individual to change the face of network television since the late 1950s.

Tinker even looks like the ultimate McLuhanesque television man—cool, relaxed, self-confident, alternately glib and avuncular.

If no one has seen Grant Tinker walk on water, no one doubts that he has led NBC to

the promised land in the four years that he has been in charge. Consider that when Tinker took over from Fred Silverman, NBC's failed leader, the network was barely breaking even. Consider that in 1985, NBC became the first network in history to sell \$1 billion worth of prime-time advertising before the fall season even began.

Along the way, Tinker seems to have won the kind of admiration usually reserved for subjects of obituaries. Says William P. Croasdale, vice president of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn (better known as BBDO), one of the country's most powerful advertising agencies. "I cannot be high enough in my praise for this man, not only for what he has done, but for the statesmanlike fashion in which he has done it. My reaction was like a lot of others—I knew the job that he had done at MTM, but I knew the quagmire he was walking into. . . . The big thing he brought was stability. Historically, whenever a new chieftain came in, you expected heads to roll, a whole new team brought in. He did some pruning, but he gave Brandon [Tartikoff, head of programming for NBC under both Silverman and Tinker] the support he needed."

Norman Lear, creator of All in the Family and a vocal critic of network television, says, "There's no doubt in my mind that corporate America lives with a total obsession of dealing with the short term. Among the companies that are the best in trying not to do that is NBC since Grant got there. Tartikoff and he have done some brilliant things."

Sy Yanoff, now general manager of CBS Boston affiliate Channel 7, who was general manager of NBC affiliate Channel 4 when Tinker was hired by NBC, recalls. "The first speech he gave to the affiliates was very realistic about the length of time it would take and what he hoped to accomplish with quality programming. I was very impressed with him from the start. He had a self-confidence that was very reassuring. . . . A couple of years later, the affiliates wanted Tartikoff's head, and he never gave it to them. It was a stroke of genius, Tartikoff bearing a lot of responsibility for their accomplishments in prime time."

Even television critics, not known for their love of network executives, voted him their first lifetime-achievement award last year, with Tinker outpolling the rest of the candidates put together.

But what Tinker did—make lots of money for NBC—is less impressive than how he did it: with more quality programs than any commercial network has ever provided at one time: Hill Street Blues (when he was head of MTM), Cheers, Family Ties, St. Elsewhere, Remington Steele, Late Night with David Letterman, Miami Vice, The Cosby Show, Steven Spielberg's Amazing Stories, and Golden Girls.

None of these shows is exactly Death of a Salesman, but together they are indicative of programming that had all but gone out of style 10 years ago—literate (or, as New York magazine television critic John Leonard said of Miami Vice, postliterate), witty, emotional, sometimes even exhilarating.

THE RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN SHOW

Tinker was born in Stamford, Connecticut. His father was in the lumber business, providing a comfortable but not lavish upbringing. Like Tartikoff, Tinker became an Ivy League English major. At Dartmouth in 1949 he wrote his thesis on the comedy of Richard Brinsley Sheridan and then embarked on his first tour of duty with NBC,

as a management trainee ("Can't you see a direct line from Sheridan to Cosby?" he says). He would leave (in 1952, for a stint as a television executive for advertising agencies), come back (in 1961, as a programming vice president), and leave again—in 1967 to become programming executive of Universal and 20th Century Fox Studios.

Tinker married Mary Tyler Moore in 1962, and in 1970 the two formed the production company that would bear her initials and produce her program, *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*, for CBS. (Tinker's first marriage produced a daughter and three sons, two of whom work on *St. Elsewhere*.) After 11 years of developing MTM into a highly regarded, effectively run organization, Tinker received the call for his third coming to NBC.

After a year or so into the job. The news division was in a shambles, playing musical anchors on the evening news, not being able to come up with a prime-time magazine, and losing viewers in the morning to *Good Morning, America*. Daytime serials were still lagging far behind those on ABC and CBS. And broadcasting and advertising executives were wondering about Tinker as NBC renewed four programs whose ratings would have spelled termination on just about any other network in any other year—*Cheers*, *St. Elsewhere*, *Remington Steele*, and *Family Ties*. And fans of quality television were angered when NBC canceled four other highly regarded programs—*SCTV*, *Fame*, *NBC News Overnight*, and *Taxi*.

There was another disgruntled observer. At the 1983 Emmy ceremonies, which in retrospect marked the turning point for NBC, the network won 33 awards, compared with 14 for ABC, 11 for CBS, and 4 for PBS. One of the winners was Judd Hirsch as best actor in a comedy series—the just canceled *Taxi*. Hirsch used the occasion to lash NBC for canceling the program: He held up the Emmy statue and proceeded to berate both Tinker and the network.

Tinker, whose network was dominating the Emmys that night—and has been the leader ever since—did not look like a happy man. "At the moment, it happened so quickly it was more embarrassing than painful, because, you know, you're sitting in an audience and you can't react," he says.

But it wasn't quality programming that was responsible for solving NBC's immediate problems. In January, the month each year that the networks' second season begins, NBC introduced three programs as midseason replacements. In 1983 it began a series that would be its only Top 20 hit at the time—*The A-Team*. In January of 1984 came two more replacements—TV's *Bloopers* and *Practical Jokes* and *Riptide*.

All three were enormous commercial successes, but none was exactly Emmy material. NBC was becoming financially solvent, but critics were starting to ask if making money with mindless programming was all there was to the Tinker-Tartikoff strategy.

THE PEACOCK FLIES

Tinker was sounding frustrated in interviews at that point. For the second time in his career, he was blaming the TV audience for the wretched programming they were getting. In the mid-1970s, the success of ABC programs like *Happy Days* and *Three's Company* was driving MTM and Norman Lear programs off the air. Tinker was telling the press then that he didn't know whether he belonged in television anymore. He told television critic Gary Deeb, "If things get really bad, I don't think I could start doing Mork and Mindy just to

make a living. I might just find another line of work." But then came the success of *Lou Grant* and *M-A-S-H*, and things seemed more hopeful.

In 1983, as head of NBC, Tinker was again sounding depressed. He was attacking the television audience for preferring junk to quality and warning that if junk was what the audience wanted, junk was what they were going to get. It was getting harder to make programs like *Lou Grant*, he said. He and Tartikoff even turned down a program for being "too literate."

But while *The A-Team* and *Bloopers* were setting the tone on one front, the Tinker-Tartikoff strategy of staying with quality shows was starting to pay off. *Hill Street Blues* had become a bona fide hit, attracting the most viewers from 10 to 11 p.m. on Thursdays. *Cheers* was inching toward the Top 20. *Remington Steele* was reaping the benefits of the two programs that aired before it—*The A-Team* and *Riptide*. *St. Elsewhere* was making marginal but steady rating gains, as was *Late Night with David Letterman*.

Even more important, NBC was deriving some enormous fringe benefits from its quality programs. According to Tartikoff, the reason for coming up with programs like *Hill Street Blues* and *Cheers* was to develop programs with an urban appeal: "In 1981, when we only made \$48 million in profits [a pittance for a network, considering the high cost of program development] we tried to work out of the gutter by making shows that could at least help our five stations. [Each network owns at least five television stations, all in major urban areas.] Since they contribute to NBC earnings, we could make half our profits in one place and the other half on the network. Programs like *Lobo* and *B.J. and the Bears* and *CHiPs* were getting 17 shares on our owned stations and 25 shares nationally." Programs like *Hill Street* and *Cheers* reversed that trend. (A share is the percentage of television sets in use at a given time. Any program with less than a 21 share is generally considered a failure.)

Quality programming had another financial bonus for NBC. While demographic research was nothing new, the advertising agencies were becoming increasingly sophisticated in using the research for targeting audiences. And the rise of NBC's, more urban—and urbane—programming has gone hand-in-hand with that research. For one thing, women were having children later in life, changing the key demographic age group from 18 through 49 to 21 through 54, and, as one might expect, tastes grew more sophisticated from one demographic to the other. Programs like *Laverne and Shirley* that made ABC Number 1 in the mid-1970s—and nearly drove Tinker out of television—were passe, and programs like *Cheers* were in.

And advertisers were asking other questions: How do I reach upscale viewers? How do I reach viewers who don't watch much television? How do I reach homes where cable has bitten into the network share of the audience? In these and other key demographic groups, the answer would come back, advertise on NBC programs such as *Hill Street Blues* or *St. Elsewhere* or *The A-Team* (which, perhaps out of camp appeal, has attracted good demographics). When a program attracts good demographics, the network charges a premium on 30-second commercials. NBC charges as much for a commercial on *Hill Street*—\$200,000—as CBS does for *Knots Landing*, the more pop-

ular of the two shows. In the case of *St. Elsewhere*, it was that program's demographics, combined with Tinker and Tartikoff's admiration for the program, that saved it from cancellation after the low ratings of the first year.

By the beginning of the 1984-85 season, NBC was in solid financial shape, but it was still well behind CBS and ABC in overall ratings. While ABC was banking on, and failing with, glitzy nighttime soaps such as *Paper Dolls* and *Glitter*, NBC introduced three programs that would lift the network from a weak third in the overall ratings to a strong second, behind CBS. One was a sentimental family drama with Michael Landon playing an angel come to Earth. *Highway to Heaven* may have drawn nothing but guffaws from critics, but it boosted the ratings for the network's Wednesday night lineup.

Had *Miami Vice* appeared on any other network, it most likely would have been canceled early on as it struggled against competition from CBS' Friday night powerhouse, *Falcon Crest*. Like its *Cheers* and *St. Elsewhere* predecessors, *Miami Vice* was attracting a slow but steady growth in the ratings, particularly in the demographically desirable categories. And once *Falcon Crest* went into reruns, *Miami Vice* began to soar. It went as high as Number 2 one week and seems primed to win in its time period against *Falcon Crest* this year.

The program that really rocketed NBC out of the ratings cellar combined the commercial success and the family values of *Highway to Heaven* with the critical success and sophisticated humor of *Cheers*. Advertising executives had predicted that Jell-O and Coca-Cola salesman Bill Cosby had come up with a hit, but no one foresaw that *The Cosby Show* would become the most popular program on television, outrating even *Dynasty* and *Dallas* by the end of the year. America was so taken by the warmth, wit, and strength of Cosby's vision of family life that the three comedies that followed *Cosby* on the Thursday night schedule—*Family Ties*, *Cheers*, and *Night Court*—became Top 20 hits themselves.

This year the momentum is clearly on NBC's side. It has three more potential "quality" shows, Steven Spielberg's *Amazing Stories* (and it's no accident that Spielberg came to NBC with his idea for an anthology series), a new version of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*, and a situation comedy about three women in their 50s, *Golden Girls*, starring Bea Arthur of *Maude* fame and written by Susan Harris of *Soap*. NBC also has a potential commercial success in Robert Blake's *Hell Town*, about an irreverent priest's attempts to keep his poor neighborhood crime-free.

Even if NBC doesn't overtake CBS as the top-rated network, it will almost certainly win more prime-time advertising dollars than either of its competitors, as buyers are climbing aboard the demographic bandwagon. And Tinker's belief that quality programming can be commercially successful has been completely vindicated: "I'm beginning to be a little encouraged again by some of the things that are succeeding—mostly on NBC, I will selfishly say, but maybe elsewhere occasionally, too. . . . I don't know if it can ever happen across the board; there just isn't that much audience that wants that kind of product. But anyway, I'm a little more optimistic and a little more cheerful about it. Look how cheerful I am."

Tinker does indeed look a great deal more cheerful these days than his counterparts at the other networks. Executives at CBS and

ABC are even taking lessons from the NBC experience, even if they won't admit it publicly. At ABC, there is talk about giving producers more creative freedom and leaving programs on longer before canceling them—even though, except for *Spenser: For Hire*, they are probably not worth saving. At CBS, with programs that appeal to an older, more conservative audience, there is a concerted effort to go after younger demographics with programs such as *Hometown* (already canceled), *West 57th*, and *The Twilight Zone*, although none—with the possible exception of *Twilight Zone*—have the NBC stamp of quality on them.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukraine issued the "Fourth Universal," a tragically short-lived document declaring its independence.

Yesterday, the city of Buffalo and the county of Erie formally recognized Ukrainian Independence Day, and this afternoon I am proud to co-host a reception commemorating this event.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with you an article written by Mike Vogel for the Buffalo Evening News, and a statement which issued from the 1985 Conference of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations and European Freedom Council, submitted by its president, former Ukrainian Prime Minister Yaroslav Stetsko.

The material follows:

[From Heritage]

UKRAINIANS TODAY HONOR DREAM OF FREEDOM

(By Mike Vogel)

Some may call it a dream that faltered, but perhaps it wasn't the dream that faltered, but the world.

This morning, the City of Buffalo and the County of Erie once more offered a joint proclamation honoring the dream, as they commemorated the declaration of independence that freed the Ukraine on Jan. 22, 1918.

The declaration issued in Kiev that day is known more formally as the "Fourth Universal," and it proved to be tragically short-lived. In 1921, Russia exerted its domination over the region, and in 1923 the Ukraine was incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Every year, though, Ukrainians gather to remember and to celebrate the glory of a moment that ended 200 years of foreign domination and provided a brief window of freedom for a troubled people in a troubled land. There would be more tragedy ahead, in a man-made famine and the devastation of a two-front war, but for those brief months in the Ukraine after 1918 there was a liberty and room to dream, at last.

"It's important that we keep it alive," said Dasha Procyk of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

"It's now the 68th year that we are doing it. We feel it's very important to continue, to remember that freedom is something every human being wants."

Sunday, all the churches in the small but active local Ukrainian-American community

will offer Masses in remembrance, and a full commemorative program will begin at 2 p.m. in the Common Council Chambers at City Hall. Two survivors of the men who fought for that too-brief freedom will attend.

Nineteen active Ukrainian organizations will participate, and two Ukrainian veterans organizations will present colors. The 36-voice women's choir known as Mriya, the Dream, will perform Ukrainian songs, and two sisters, Laryssa and Myrosia Mychaskiw, will play the bandura. Speeches will be made by Assemblyman Dennis T. Gorski, D-Cheektowaga, and by Dr. Mychajlo Loza.

That is all well and good.

But there is more to this commemoration than just the performances that keep alive an old-world culture in a new-world land. There is a lesson in the tale of the Ukraine.

The lesson is that freedom is not a state, but a process.

There is glory in declaring independence, but that elation bears a continuing price of hard work through the years, as the harshness of the world and the pressures of existence threaten to erode the liberty and tarnish the glory.

After 200 years of domination, the Ukraine tasted that glory. And then it tasted defeat.

Lenin's Russia was one of the nations that recognized Ukrainian sovereignty, but then followed that recognition with a declaration of war.

The world was too much for the fragile freedom that once graced the poppy-strewn fields of a faraway land. Ukrainian freedom fighters were caught between forces fighting for communism and forces fighting for the czar. Freedom, like the poppies, was trampled in the struggle.

Some of those who had fought and lost sought a new land as a haven for their dreams and their freedoms.

They look, now, to a new generation to guard what they found—the fulfillment of dreams, in freedoms that Americans often take for granted.

And while they gather this week to remember what freedom once meant to their homeland, perhaps we would do well to pause and recall what it means to ours.

[Conference, November 21-24, 1985, London, Great Britain]

ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS AND EUROPEAN FREEDOM COUNCIL
THE PROBLEMS FACING US

Today's attention is focused on the recent summit between President Reagan and Soviet Russian dictator Mikhail Gorbachov. The issue at hand is primarily military. The importance of this issue is a consequence of the gains of Russian imperialism under the guise of communism, whose primary goal is world domination. Only the collapse of the Soviet Russian empire will decidedly eliminate the threat of a nuclear holocaust. To achieve this end, attention must be drawn to the Achilles' Heel of the Soviet Russian empire and its system: the subjugated nations. Without the inclusion of the issue of the subjugated nations into the creation of new realities in the world, all agreements and pacts of exclusively military nature will not eliminate the crisis. The crux of the matter lies not in a change of guard in the Kremlin which will never disavow its imperialism and aggressiveness, but in the striving for freedom and national independence of the subjugated nations. In the final analysis they are the key to the resolution of the world crisis, and in this context they must be viewed as a political superpower.

Naturally, the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) is against nuclear war and proposes its own alternative for the elimination of the root cause of the present world crisis. The ABN supports zero option and stands for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. The ABN also supports the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as the most humane proposal to date—one which destroys weapons not people. This is a revolutionary idea because from the dawn of man weapons were directed against people, whereas now a plan has been advanced to destroy weapons and not people. Only those who harbour ill will could be opposed to the deployment of such a strategic defense system. Even in the advent of difficulty in implementing such a system based on the SDI, the idea itself is worthy of support for the sake of humanity and plain political decency and wisdom.

No temporary solutions will solve the crisis if lasting solutions are not phased in on a parallel basis. The subject of this conference is precisely to establish a basis for that lasting solution which, in our view, is rooted in the invincible human quest for freedom and independence inherent in every man and nation on earth. The key is to find a way to release the explosive power of revolution among the subjugated nations which, in turn would bring down the Soviet Russian empire—that prison of nations par excellence.

What is the *raison d'être* of this world conflict? What does Soviet Russia really seek? Moscow's goal is to hold on to the subjugated nations and to gain control over increasingly more countries until global domination finally is complete. By now the goal should be known to all, although there is a lack of effort to voice this fact loud and clear. The crux of the matter is that Moscow's object of conquest—the captive nations fighting to stay free—be recognized as a power potentially capable of breaking up the imperial structure of Soviet Russia.

By fostering and strengthening by means of the available communications technologies the infrastructures of the subjugated nations and by counterposing our system and philosophy of life to the Bolshevik system a psychostrategic offensive can systematically undermine the Soviet Russian system of occupation. Moreover, if the West would cease its economic and other types of relations with the Soviet Union, if it would stop supplying it with grain, technology, credits, and soon, Moscow would be forced to allow, albeit reluctantly, the revival of socio-economic institutions, such as, for example, the private ownership of land (to increase agricultural production). This, in turn, would strengthen the indigenous infrastructures of the captive nations further undermining the colonial system of Soviet Russia in very real terms.

Soviet Russian imperialism follows many paths and the response to it must be equally varied. It is not a classical type of imperialism, but one which attempts to impose upon the nations it controls a totally alien philosophy and way of life. Given this fact, the liberation process in the subjugated nations cannot be viewed only in military and technical terms because we are dealing here with a revolutionary process encompassing all the spiritual, cultural, social, economic, political and religious dimensions of the existence of those nations. Western psychostrategists should take notice of this unique revolutionary phenomenon taking place behind the Iron Curtain, a phenomenon which can be fully interpreted, analysed and conveyed by those representatives of the

subjugated nations who are organically tied to their nation's spirituality and philosophy of life, by those who have not been affected by the scourge of so-called "progressivism" and "new-speak" created by the Soviet Russian "Big Brother" (to use Orwell's concepts) and his system.

The theme of the conference—"High and Low Frontier: Strategic Defense and Liberation"—describes the path to follow if the Free World is eventually to prevail over Soviet Russian totalitarianism. "High Frontier" is the actual implementation of the results of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). "Low Frontier" is a psycho-strategic and political offensive against Soviet Russia which should be based on the inclusion of the captive nations as a vital element in the West's own active measures, with a commitment to provide assistance to prospective insurgencies on the territories of the subjugated nations. The combination of "High Frontier" with "Low Frontier" fully addresses the search for a solution to the impasse in the current world crisis, provides a viable alternative to the threat of a nuclear confrontation between Soviet Russia and the West, offers a way out of the sham that the so-called "disarmament process" has become over the decades and, lastly, it provides a blueprint for dismantling the Soviet Russian empire with the least risk to humanity. A synthesis of "High" and "Low" Frontiers is today the only road that can lead to a world of peace, security and freedom for all the nations on earth. The means of achieving a safe and free world are at hand. The United States and the whole Free World must now muster enough political will and moral strength to break out from the vicious circle of false detente, "containment", "spheres of influence", hopes of "convergence of east and west" and embark on the road of saving humanity from oblivion. There is no other alternative.—Yaroslav Stetsko, ABN President, Former Prime Minister of Ukraine.

STUDENTS AND THE GATEWAY TO EXCELLENCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last November, students from across the country joined together in Washington to speak to lawmakers about their concerns over the future of higher education funding.

This meeting, the second "National Student Summit," organized by student government leaders from the City University of New York, was well-attended not only by their fellow student leaders, but also by Members of Congress. In this summit, they sought to focus on the pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, H.R. 3700, passed by the House earlier this month.

As New York's senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I want to commend the leaders of this meeting, particularly Melvin Lowe, CUNY student senate president and Frank Viggiano, executive director of USS, for their hard work and dedicated efforts to bring this summit to fruition. Their efforts have assisted those of us who are deeply involved in the reauthorization process in helping to focus greater attention on student issues and concerns.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert into the RECORD a copy of the statement issued by the student leaders who attended the summit, entitled "Funding for Higher Education: The Gateway to Excellence."

FUNDING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: THE GATEWAY TO EXCELLENCE

(A Joint Statement from the Second National Student Summit of State and Campus Student Association Leaders)

Student leaders representing more than 6 million students from across the Nation have assembled in Washington, D.C., to defend the Federal role in higher education. National Student Summit II is an outgrowth of the successful National Student Summit I held in May in New York.

This statement is a response to the proposed House of Representatives Reauthorization Bill, H.R. 3700, and it includes a set of recommendations for Senate consideration.

First, while we support the majority of the House Bill, we will take this opportunity to address those areas which will adversely affect student financial aid. Second, although we understand and support the need to reduce the Federal deficit, we express our opposition to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Amendment because of its implications for student financial aid.

Financial assistance is threatened and discredited by the perpetuation of national myths about financial aid, most notably overexaggerated and inflated loan default rates. Student leaders have highlighted a study confirming the improved status of the Guaranteed Student Loan program collections.

The student leaders at the National Student Summit II represent a united voice of concern. We oppose any changes that reduce access to higher education because it is the key to economic growth, political enfranchisement, and social development.

PROVIDING THE OPPORTUNITY: STUDENT AID

The opportunity to receive a postsecondary education is currently slipping out of the grasp of many citizens in this country as the result of the deterioration of student financial aid programs. Effective student aid makes education affordable at all institutions of higher education. It is the great equalizer between the rich and the poor.

A slow erosion, however, has been taking place in the foundation of student financial aid. The gap between grants, work study, and loans has widened to a point where it is becoming critical. The disparity is evidenced in the figures below.

PERCENT OF ALL AWARDS

Year	Grants/ workstudy	Loans
1976	83	17
1979	70	30
1985	48	52

We are alarmed at this shift in the grant/loan balance, because we are creating a greater burden on students, a greater threat to their futures, and a long range negative effect on the economy. Loans were not meant to take the place of grant and work study programs. This shift needs to be re-evaluated by Congress and action taken to correct this imbalance.

We believe that House Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 addresses

some of these concerns while expanding present programs at little cost. Current higher education programs cost the federal government \$9.2 billion per year. The House bill which reauthorizes student aid and other programs for the next five years will cost less than \$10 billion per year. In this context, student aid is a large investment in our nation's future.

We agree with the general direction of the House version of reauthorization. We object, however, to the proposed definition of a self-supporting (independent) student, which excludes needy students below an arbitrarily selected age from being recognized as independent except in unusual circumstances. There is an significant evidence to support the claim that students are abusing this aid provision. Economic conditions experienced by the applicants should be the criteria for eligibility to receive aid as independent student. Federal aid is to be sensitive to need, not age, and must remain so.

Shifting the burden of funding of the College Workstudy Program from the current institution contribution of 20% to 25% in 1989-90 and to 30% in 1990-91 is unacceptable. This will result in higher institutional costs and a lessened incentive to employ students at fair wages. In addition, we oppose payment of sub-minimum wages under any circumstances.

The Next Step: Senate Considerations

The next step in the reauthorization process is the preparation of a bill by the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities. The bill advanced by the House, as stated earlier, provides many features which we believe should be considered in the preparation of the Senate bill.

We therefore propose that the following recommendations be considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities:

Title IV

1. Pell Grants.—Establish the maximum Pell award at \$2,300 in academic year 1987-88, \$2,500 in 88-89, \$2,700 in academic year 89-90, \$2,900 in academic 90-91, and \$3,100 in academic 91-92. Provide for a minimum award of \$200 for all students except in the case of less than half-time students, for whom the minimum award should be \$50.

We oppose any attempt to attach an academic requirement in order to qualify for a Pell Grant. We believe that the present monitoring system which allows individual institutions to set standards of academic progress has worked well.

2. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants.—Establish the SEOG authorization level at \$500 million in FY87 and "such sums" for succeeding fiscal years. Increase the maximum amount of award to \$4,000. Require that recipients demonstrate need. Preference will be given to those students with greatest need.

3. State Student Incentive Grant.—Establish the SSIG authorization at \$100 million in FY1987 and "such sums" for succeeding fiscal years. Permit funds in excess of FY1985 appropriations to be used for need-based state work/study programs. Increase the maximum award from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

4. TRIO.—Establish TRIO authorization at \$400 million in FY 1987 and "such sums" for succeeding fiscal years. Establish a National Center for Postsecondary Opportunity to insure that adequate information on student aid reaches students, parents, counselors and others. Fund through set aside of \$5 million from the Department's operating

budget. Permit use of peer counselors in the Student Support Services program.

5. Child Care Services for Economically Disadvantaged Students.—Authorize \$15 million in FY 1987 and "such sums" in succeeding fiscal years. Grants will enable institutions of higher education to provide child care services to low-income and first generation college students.

6. Federal, State and Private Student Loan Programs.—Retain the current loan limits of \$2,500 for undergraduates in their first two years. Expand to \$3,500 loan limits for undergraduates at the junior, senior or equivalent level.

Extend the grace period before repayment from 6 to 9 months.

Phase out the origination fee at the rate of 1% a year. Also discontinue charging a processing fee for GSL's, as contrary to Congressional intent. Require all students to show need to qualify for the GSL program, but retain its structure as an entitlement. Permit guarantee agencies and others to issue consolidation loans to students with debts over \$7,500.

7. Work/Study Programs.—Authorize \$700 million in FY 1987 and "such sums" in succeeding fiscal years.

Include graduate and professional students in the statement of purposes of the college work/study program.

Provide that if an institution includes part-time students in the determination of their need for part-time students, such students be provided a "reasonable proportion" of such funds.

Permit students who have exhausted their eligibility for college work/study to continue employment in non-work/study jobs at the institution for the remainder of the semester. We further recommend that the Federal Government work through the Small Business Administration to enhance cooperative workstudy and internship programs between colleges and businesses.

8. National Direct Student Loans.—Authorize \$300 million in FY 1987 and "such sums" in succeeding fiscal years.

Provide for a priority in making awards to students from families with incomes below the median family income.

Expand loan limits for undergraduate, graduate and preprofessional students.

Extend the deferment period from 6 to 9 months. We would note our opposition to any new provision that authorizes the assessment of "late charges" for the failure of a borrower to pay on time.

9. Single Needs Analysis.—We support the concept of moving to a single need analysis for federal financial aid programs, based primarily on the Uniform Methodology System.

Among other things, such a system should clarify the requirement that students not be charged a fee for applying for federal financial aid, establish a federal financial aid calendar to facilitate an orderly and timely operation of the federal aid system, and has the provision that less-than-half-time students are eligible for assistance under the Title IV programs.

10. Toll-Free Number.—We believe that the now-defunct idea of a national student aid hotline should be revived, and support language that directs the Secretary to develop such a system.

11. Part-time Student Aid.—Part-time students make up one of the fastest growing sectors in postsecondary education. Between 1972 and 1982, part-time student enrollment increased 61% until it accounted for 5 million students, representing 41% of postsec-

ondary and 50% of community and junior college enrollments nationwide. Facing significant financial and personal obligations, part-time students make great sacrifices to attend college. We commend Congressman Biaggi's work on behalf of the part-time student population in financial aid programs in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

12. Loan Deferment.—We strongly support deferment of loan repayment for up to six months for parental leave for borrowers who are interrupting school deferment periods for prenatal or infant care and who are not gainfully employed. We further support deferment for up to five years for all public elementary or secondary school teachers.

Title IX

Students applaud the creation of an aid program for the nation's graduate students. We would suggest, however, that several alterations be made in the current structure of the program:

1. Under the proposed House bill, institutions would compete for graduate aid dollars on the basis of "merit" in terms of their graduate curriculum. Aid money awarded would then be distributed by the institution to the students. Further, aid availability would be restricted to those areas of graduate study that are of "critical need"; that is, they are judged to be priorities in terms of research.

2. While supportive of the general concept of aid to graduate students, we would suggest that a more effective method of distributing the aid dollars would be to provide it to the students directly, rather than filtering it through the institutions. Further, we believe that the availability of aid should not be limited to areas of "critical need", since such determinations will inevitably be arbitrary and transient. Rather, we recommend that student need should be the only criteria in the awarding of aid money.

Title XI

Students recognize the unique role played by the nation's urban universities, and we are supportive of programs designed to strengthen that role. We support cooperative programs among higher educational institutions and urban centers across the country.

CONCLUSION

In an era of declining federal resources, educational funding is especially important because it represents an investment in the future of this nation and contributes to the economic vitality of our country.

The House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee has pointed out that this Reauthorization Bill is a step back from allowing student assistance to middle income citizens, as expressed in the "Middle Income Assistance Act." Access to higher education to disadvantaged students is again perceived as the priority for federal student aid.

The ability of the federal government to provide even minimal levels of access has been eroded by gradual dissipation in national attention. This generation of students and higher education professionals has a mission: Reawaken the sense of egalitarianism that first made possible the Higher Education Act of 1965, to once again encourage a bitter and cynical public that federal spending is not always wasteful and inefficient, but that it can be a force to social good. We must recreate a national consensus that a strong system of higher education, accessible to all, is the litmus test to an advanced society. Finally, we must commit ourselves to the preservation of the federal

role in higher education as a measure to the generosity and self-sacrifice of the American people.

Such a task is what the student leaders gathered here have taken upon themselves. There are over six million reasons expressed in the six million students represented here—that will succeed.

LAUNCHING OF THE PLUMA DE ORO WRITERS COMPETITION

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to have the opportunity to share with my colleagues news of an exciting competition for Spanish language writers that was launched recently at a press conference.

The Pluma De Oro Spanish literary competition will be open to all U.S. citizens and residents, as well as foreign students and exchange scholars who have equal opportunities to contribute to the enrichment of the Spanish language. Funding for the Pluma De Oro competition is being provided by a grant from the American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. One hundred leading figures in the worlds of business, politics, academia, media, and publishing as well as the ambassadors of the Spanish-speaking countries are being invited to join a national board or "patronato" of the award program. The board will give directives and establish policy guidelines for the competition. From among that board a jury committee will be selected. That committee will recommend jurors and organize the juries that will read, comment, and select the finalists. Juries will be comprised of Spanish and Latin American authors, academicians, publishers, and critics as well as their U.S. counterparts.

As a fitting prelude to the 1992 celebration of the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' discovery and opening of the New World—Columbus Day, October 12, 1986, will be the final deadline for the submission of manuscripts. The first prizes will be awarded in January 1987. Thereafter, prizes will be awarded in January of every year. Details on how to enter the competition will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, the Pluma De Oro competition, will give the United States, a country of 20 million Spanish-speaking people, recognition as having a place in the shared culture of Spain and Latin America. Given the Spanish language's early and significant role in U.S. culture, the national competition for literary prizes in Spanish will serve as a key unifying link between the two major languages of the hemisphere: English and Spanish.

Increasingly, English-speaking Americans are becoming more familiar with some of the best writers of the Spanish language like Mario Vargas Llosa, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Octavio Paz, Julio Cortazar, and others. The competition will highlight the Spanish language's early and significant role in U.S. culture. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve as a member of the Pluma De Oro Ex-

Executive Committee and will be doing all I can to spread the word about the national competition. I would like to commend the American Express Travel Related Services Co., for launching this competition today that will serve to highlight the many outstanding works of Spanish-speaking writers in the United States.

PRIZES FOR SPANISH LITERATURE WRITTEN IN THE UNITED STATES

SUMMARY

A national competition for the best literary works written in the Spanish language in the United States is being established. The competition, the first of its kind, will stimulate literary production in Spanish, and will give the United States, a country of 20 million Spanish-speaking people, recognition as having a place in the shared culture of Spain and Latin America. The project will act as a link among Hispanics in the United States and as a bridge to the English-speaking population which increasingly appreciates Iberoamerican culture. It will also be a prelude to the 1992 celebration of the 500th Anniversary of Christopher Columbus' discovery and opening of the New World.

Funding for the Pluma de Oro competition, including cash awards, is being provided by a grant from the American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc.

One hundred leading figures in the worlds of business, politics, academia, media and publishing, as well as the Ambassadors of the Spanish-speaking countries are being invited to join the National Board or "Patronato" of the awards program. The board will give directives and establish policy guidelines for the competition.

From among the "Patronato" a Jury Committee will be selected. This committee will recommend jurors and organize the juries that will read, comment and select the finalists. Juries will be comprised of Spanish and Latin American authors, academicians, publishers and critics as well as their U.S. counterparts.

Columbus Day (October 12, 1986) will be the final deadline for the submission of manuscripts. The first prizes will be awarded in January of 1987. Thereafter, prizes will be awarded in January of every year.

THE SPANISH LANGUAGE: AN INTERNATIONAL ASSET OF THE UNITED STATES

Rewarding the literary craft is a cultural tradition that began with the Greeks. In the United States, there are several well-funded literary prizes for English productions, but only a few locally-organized prizes for works written in Spanish. Thus, writers of the Spanish language in the United States who want to be recognized may become discouraged to use their language.

Since Columbus brought the Spanish language to the Western Hemisphere in 1492, it has become one of the most precious elements of the diverse cultural heritage of the United States.

As an official language in the United Nations for decades, and now, with the entry of Spain into the European Economic Community, Spanish has enhanced its status as a major international language.

Increasingly, English-speaking Americans are becoming more familiar with some of the best writers of the Spanish language like Mario Vargas Llosa, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Octavio Paz, Julio Cortazar and others.

Spanish is the language with the largest enrollment in U.S. colleges, having taken

the historical lead from French more than a decade ago. In fact, a majority of the academic journals dedicated to Spanish and Latin American letters are published in the United States. Furthermore, every major U.S. university has at least one world-class scholar whose expertise covers the most important aspects of Spanish and Latin American literature. Over fifty percent of the master's and Ph.D. theses and dissertations on Latin American, Spanish literature and linguistics are produced by U.S. academics.

This rich reality is part of what we will be celebrating in 1992, five hundred years after Queen Isabella's ships brought the Spanish language to America.

HISPANICS IN THE UNITED STATES

"Hispanic" is a general term used in the United States to describe a group of people who share a common language and culture. Perhaps the most dramatic characteristic of the U.S. Hispanic population is that they are on the way to becoming the largest "minority" in this country. In fact, if the U.S. Hispanic population were to be counted as a "separate country," it would be the fifth largest "country" in the complex of nations that speak Spanish.

The group, however, is far from homogeneous. The term itself is, at times, misleading, for it includes peoples from 20 different countries around the world—countries which are unique in themselves.

The Spanish language, more than any other cultural trait, has served and continues to serve as the key unifying link among this group, as well as the link among Spanish-speaking countries.

LITERARY PRIZES

Given the Spanish language's early and significant role in U.S. culture, the idea of a national competition for literary prizes in Spanish would seem to be in order. Among the immediate and long term consequences of this project are the following:

1. It will, through the prizes, be a fitting match for the prestigious literary prizes awarded annually in Spanish-speaking countries, mainly Spain, and will draw national attention to the need to use the language elegantly and effectively.

2. It will show the rest of the nation that the leaders of the U.S. Hispanic population care for and are willing to support the humanities and cultivate the arts.

3. It will increase the interest of major corporations and businesses catering to the needs of Hispanics in supporting this unique enterprise. Spanish newspapers, radio stations and television networks will be natural backers of the project.

4. It will increase the self-esteem of future teachers, translators, business people and diplomats. Hispanics will realize that the elegant use of the Spanish language is recognized and rewarded.

5. It will constitute a solid link between the two major languages of the hemisphere, English and Spanish, by acting as a diplomatic bridge toward Latin America. In a sense, then, the prizes will be an investment in better political relations with Latin America and Spain, showing that the United States is willing to nurture and develop this gift received from the Spanish-speaking nations.

6. It will draw the immediate interest of Spanish and Latin American publishers and writers to enter aggressively into a market that in the past has been only indirectly cultivated. Publishers will now have the option of publishing U.S.-produced works in the Spanish language with the expectation of

sales matching the traditional prize-winning books.

DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS

The Pluma de Oro Spanish Literary Prizes will be governed by a prestigious National Board or "Patronato". Within the Board there will be two committees:

1. An Executive Committee which will guide and supervise the normal operations of the competition in accordance with the broader policy guidelines set by the Board as a whole.

2. A Jury Committee which will recommend names for the jury pool from which jurors will be selected. For each of the prize categories, a jury will read, comment and select the candidates' final manuscripts. Each jury will be composed of at least four members: possibly one writer, one academician, one editor and one critic or journalist. The exact guidelines for juries will be set by the Board.

The Board will give directives to the North-South Center of the University of Miami, which will act as Executive Secretariat of the project by supplying staff, academic resources, meeting places and communication links. In addition to the two committees of the Board, an International Honorary Board of renowned writers will guide the Executive Secretariat. The Secretariat will be chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School of International Studies and Director of the North-South Center.

Prizes will be awarded in the following five categories: *Novel, Short Story, Drama, Poetry, and Essay*. In each category, there will be two different levels: general prizes and student prizes. The general prizes are endowed with a minimum cash prize of \$2,000, while student prizes are endowed with \$500. It is hoped that the works of the winners will be published and/or produced, within a year, as previously established through agreements with publishing houses, theatre companies and other institutions.

The competition is open to all United States citizens and residents, as well as foreign students and exchange scholars who will have equal opportunities to contribute to the enrichment of the Spanish language.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chairman—Bernard J. Hamilton, President, Latin America & Caribbean Division, American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc.; **Henry Cisneros**, Mayor of San Antonio, Texas; **Manuel Duran**, Department of Spanish, Yale University; **Edward T. Foote, II**, President, University of Miami; **Federico Gil**, Professor Emeritus, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; **John N. Goudie**, President, Christopher Columbus, Quincentenary Jubilee Commission; **Rafael Hernandez Colon**, Governor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and **Bill Richardson**; **William Richardson**, Congressman, New Mexico.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

Director—Ambler H. Moss, Jr., Dean, Graduate School of International Studies, Director North-South Center; **Joaquin Roy**, Literary Advisor; and **Maria Jose Cartagena**, Coordinator.

NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBUILDING
CENTENNIAL

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 18, 1986, Senator JOHN WARNER addressed the audience gathered at Newport News Shipbuilding to celebrate the centennial of the founding of that great shipyard.

As a former Secretary of the Navy and a present senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator is uniquely qualified to discuss the challenges and opportunities facing both Newport News Shipbuilding and the U.S. Navy. His statement was both eloquent and thought-provoking, and I am pleased to share it with my colleagues.

I hope that Senator WARNER's words will receive the careful consideration they deserve.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN WARNER

It's always a thrill for me to visit this magnificent shipyard where so much of our nation's maritime history rests. Today, of course, I am particularly excited to be here to participate in these Centennial observances.

I've visited this yard many times and had the honor of participating in many naval vessel ceremonies. Always I think of successive generations of families who have produced many of the finest craftsmen to be found anywhere in the world. I think of those traditions of excellence that have been passed from grandfather to father and from father to son.

Ladies and gentlemen, the U.S. is a nation bordered by two great oceans. Our first line of defense is forward deployment. Therefore, keeping the sea lanes of communication open is essential to our survival. Only with the ships you build is this possible.

One hundred years is a long time.

If you think about it for a moment, this shipyard came into being the same year that the Statue of Liberty was dedicated. But unlike the Statue of Liberty, which is presently being remodeled—you would say "overhauled"—Newport News Shipbuilding has maintained a high level of modernization.

It's not easy for any institution to last 100 years. It takes exceptional management, exceptional craftsmen working as a team with a strong sense of dedication. This is what is responsible for the many successes Newport News Shipyard has earned in its first 100 years. And it's against this background of success that this yard is in a good position to successfully face the challenges ahead for another 100 years. Challenges to the nation's defense, challenges to Virginia's economy.

The partnership between Newport News Shipyard and the Commonwealth of Virginia is an extraordinary success story. First, this yard is, by far, the largest private employer in the state. Second, in 1985, this yard issued 47,700 purchase orders totalling \$1.8 billion to 12,255 Virginia suppliers, which means employment throughout the state. Third, the defense work performed in this yard, combined with the work done by other defense contractors throughout the state, is the primary reason why Virginia is now Number One.

By that I mean Virginia is the nation's largest recipient of defense dollars on a per capita basis. That works out to \$2,170 for every Virginian. Yes, that is good news, and many here today can take justified pride. Indeed, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the generations who preceded us, for this first place took a long time to achieve.

Virginians historically have been among the first to fight for freedom. But with this position of being Number One goes the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of excellence in every respect of defense work. If we are to remain Number One in dollars, we must be in the eyes of the nation:

Number One in the quality of craftsmanship.

Number One in efficiency and cost savings, and eliminate waste for the American taxpayer.

Number One in honesty and integrity at every level of defense contracting.

A very special burden falls upon this yard, for you are the biggest, and there is no better. So you are the standard bearer for all Virginia defense contractors. As goes Newport News Shipyard, so goes the reputation of defense contracting in Virginia!

Like a fine wine whose taste improves with age, Newport News Shipyard is building better ships than ever and, I'm confident, will continue to do so for at least another 100 years.

In this audience today are descendants of persons from all ranks and levels of authority who have guided this yard. Many of you come from families who have worked in this yard for generations, carrying on that tradition of handing down valuable skills from one generation to the next.

Never can we lose sight of the fact that these huge machines and cranes that are scattered throughout this yard are operated by people. And never can we lose sight of the fact that talented people are responsible for the good, sound management practices that have led to the successes this yard has enjoyed since 1886.

So, I think it's only appropriate that we recognize each of these fine people who are with us today, as well as those who have gone before them, who have invested of their time and talents and meant so much to this community and to our nation. I ask you to join me in recognizing the past and present employees of Newport News Shipbuilding.

We thank you!

Ladies and gentlemen, in this changing world, America's will to remain strong is being challenged in new ways. We seek a more peaceful world through a lessening of tensions with the Soviet Union in broad areas of security issues. Hopefully during the forthcoming two summit sessions positive results will be reached.

But during this same period we must strengthen our preparations to deter the astounding rise in terrorism—a rear guard threat of rising consequence.

We have only to look at the events of the past few months to appreciate how grave this situation has become. Events such as the *Achille Lauro* hijacking, the Egyptair hijacking and, of course, the senseless killing of 16 persons at the Rome and Vienna airports all underscore the threat each of us faces at the hands of terrorists. If anything, these recent episodes of terrorism clearly say something else—and that is that terrorists are engaging in a pattern of increasing senseless brutality. Each new act appears to be more sensational and grim than the one

before and the victims can be anyone from a wheelchair-bound cruise line passenger to an 11-year-old girl.

Our military, in training and in new missions for existing equipment, are preparing to deter this new threat and meet it with force when required.

The carrier, like those that are built in this yard, is being given a vital role in this important mission. In the increasingly hostile and politically uncertain environment of the Middle East, South America and parts of the third world, the U.S. cannot be assured of obtaining or continuing lasting land rights for military air bases.

In recent years, the United States has lost access to a number of air bases around the globe. We can no longer use the Wheelis air base in Libya. We can no longer use four air bases in Iran. We can no longer use four air bases in Morocco, two of which were SAC bases. We can no longer use three air bases in Greece. And now, with the tragic increase in terrorism, even the existing bases have increased problems of security.

Carriers must make up for these losses, actual and contingent. The ability of these carriers to provide forward mobile basing of American air power near crisis locations is unequalled. We witnessed the importance of our carriers in the capture of the hijackers who seized the *Achille Lauro*. The four F-14s and E-2C command and control aircraft that carried out that daring mission with less than two hours notice came from the only airfield we could be certain of in the region—the deck of a U.S. aircraft carrier—the *Saratoga*.

When you cut through all of the arguments, the irrefutable evidence remains that big carriers provide air cover that is an essential element to our forward deployed strategy—terrorism included.

Now our attention, our need to prepare, turns to the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, when the *Theodore Roosevelt*, the *Abraham Lincoln*, and the *George Washington* leave this yard to join the fleet, twelve of the fifteen carriers in the 600-ship Navy will have been built by Newport News Shipyard, including all seven of our nuclear-powered carriers. The Navy has now reached the point where it must make a major decision about the future of our first nuclear-powered carrier, the *Enterprise*.

The *Enterprise* is 25 years old and in need of modernization to bring its propulsion and warfighting systems up to date. Soon the Congress will have to review a decision to be made by the Secretary of the Navy. There are but two options: The *Enterprise* should either be entered into a service life extension program or be mothballed and replaced with a new aircraft carrier. To extend the life of *Enterprise* will be extraordinarily expensive; indeed, my research reveals it may cost nearly as much as a new ship. At present, it's my judgment that we should not restore the *Enterprise*. Rather we should build a new nuclear-powered carrier. Further, we should consider a package of two new carriers using the very successful formula of multi-year procurement. A second ship is needed to replace the aging carrier *Midway* around the year 2000.

I commit to you to do my part, not just because these contracts come to Virginia, but because these ships are essential for our defense.

I have conveyed these views to key people within the Administration, most specifically the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy. And I am confident that the

Administration will, after weighing all the facts, agree with my judgment, and that we will see such a proposal from the Navy shortly.

With such an important decision pending, there is a heavy burden on each person in this yard to continue building on the excellent reputation you have earned in these first 100 years. Further, I close with an old Navy message.

"Attention. All hands on deck!"

Should we win these new contracts, which are needed for America's defense, we will have to muster the next generation of sons and daughters of those present today to carry on our work.

Congratulations to all of you. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11246, PRESIDENT REAGAN SHOULD NOT WEAKEN ENFORCEMENT OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, January 23, 1986, by Bill Peterson, a staff writer for the Washington Post. The article, "GOP Mayor Hits Plan to Relax Hiring Rules," eloquently expresses reasons why William H. Hudnut, III, the Republican mayor of Indianapolis, believes the Reagan administration's efforts to weaken Executive Order 11246, "is a political mistake as well as being morally and legally wrong."

The corporate community strongly supports the continued, vigorous, enforcement of Executive Order 11246 and affirmative action goals and timetables. The meaningful participation of minorities and women in the workplace has greatly improved and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you and the rest of my colleagues will find this article informative and very helpful in understanding why the Executive order should be preserved in its present form.

The text is as follows:

GOP MAYOR HITS PLAN TO RELAX HIRING RULES

(By Bill Peterson)

William H. Hudnut III, the Republican mayor of Indianapolis, yesterday said an effort by the Justice Department to scale back major affirmative action directives "is a political mistake as well as being morally and legally wrong."

Hudnut said he had written a letter to President Reagan complaining about the efforts because he thought the president "hasn't been briefed well [on the issue] by the people in the injustice department."

The letter said efforts to modify or eliminate a 20-year-old presidential executive order requiring affirmative action in hiring represents "an unfortunate step backward" and would turn "the clock far back on civil rights advances."

These efforts are supported by Attorney General Edwin Meese III and William Bradford Reynolds, the department's civil rights chief. The department has attempted to

halt the use of racial hiring goals, supported by Hudnut, in an affirmative action case involving the Indianapolis police and fire departments.

Such action "sends the wrong message politically" to minorities and could damage the Republican Party, Hudnut told a news conference at the annual winter meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Two other mayors, Donna Owens (R) of Toledo, Ohio, and Thirman L. Milner (D) of Hartford, Conn., appeared with Hudnut at the news conference and endorsed his stand.

"We haven't reached that goal in the country where we can say, 'Hallelujah. There is no discrimination,'" said Owens.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., BUST DEDICATION CEREMONY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1986, a very important ceremony took place in the Capitol. On that day a bust of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was dedicated and placed in the Capitol rotunda, where it will remain on display for a period of 1 year, after which it will be moved to a permanent location in the Capitol. This ceremony was all the more moving because it coincided with the many events marking the observance of our first national holiday honoring Dr. King.

Black Americans have made countless contributions to the cultural and political development of this Nation. Yet until the placement of Dr. King's bust, not one of the many busts or statues in the Capitol depicted a black American. Though this was long overdue, I can think of no more fitting person to be the first black American honored in the Capitol than Martin Luther King.

The Capitol is our Nation's most important building. It is a symbol of our commitment to the ideals of freedom, justice and equality which are the foundation of our Republic. A memorial to Dr. King rightly belongs there—for no one in American history has better served the principles of our Nation than Dr. King. He lived for them, he fought for them, and he died for them.

Indeed, this bust of Dr. King will be more than just a memorial to a great American. It will serve as a constant reminder to the millions of American citizens and foreign visitors who tour the Capitol that our Nation remains dedicated to the full promise of American life that Dr. King so courageously championed.

Time and again during his lifetime, Dr. King would inspire us with his dream for America. He did it with passion and eloquence, knowing that the rightness of his dream was rooted in the better nature of his countrymen. His dream was an appeal to the conscience and reason of his fellow citizens. It drew from his firm belief that nonviolent social change can conquer the forces of injustice and oppression. And his message was profound in its simplicity: harmony would shame bigotry, justice would outlast its enemies, and true democracy would prevail.

Martin Luther King knew the dangers of complacency. As he wrote from his cell in the Birmingham jail in 1963, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." It was for good reason that he called himself a drum major for justice. His commitment was real.

What I said to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference 11 years ago remains true today: "They shot down the man—and they snuffed out his life—and the man died. But they could not shoot down his dream. For his dream was stronger than life and more powerful than death. And the dream lives on."

Like many Americans, I sorely miss his voice, his inspired leadership, and his courage. But his contributions have taken on a life of their own.

So I am gratified that with the ceremony placing Dr. King's bust in the Capitol, the man and his dream will be memorialized for years to come in the building that represents the center of our Government. It will serve as a message to us all.

HONORING DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to rise today and join in this tribute to the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; a man who changed the history of our Nation with four simple words: "I have a dream."

Yesterday marked the culmination of a 15-year effort to give appropriate recognition to Dr. King and his work by having a national holiday observed on his birthday. I am proud to say that I have been a strong supporter of legislation to establish this well deserved memorial to Dr. King's outstanding contributions and accomplishments.

Martin Luther King, Jr., would have celebrated his 57th birthday this year had he not been slain by a cowardly assassin. During his short life, Dr. King helped bring about enormous social changes that made America a better place for us all to live. And through his efforts to achieve equal treatment for all Americans, Martin Luther King, Jr., remained devoted to nonviolent means of achieving his goals and he inspired thousands of others to conform to his principles of nonviolence.

Through his nonviolent resistance and passionate oratory, Dr. King was able to elevate the struggle for civil rights to the forefront it deserved on the national agenda. From Montgomery, AL, to the jails of Birmingham, his spirit turned violence, bitterness, and alienation into constructive social change.

Martin Luther King, Jr.'s basic doctrine was eloquently given during a speech made at a bus boycott in Montgomery, AL:

If you will protect courageously, and yet with dignity and Christian love, when history books are written in future generations, the historians will have to pause and say, "There lived a great people—a black people—who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization." This is

our challenge and our overwhelming responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, few men have advanced the cause of justice and affected such deeply rooted changes in our society as Dr. King did. Blessed with inordinate courage and commitment, he liberated the oppressed and pulled them from the abyss of despair and frustration.

For generations to come his birthday will serve as a day when all Americans, regardless of race or creed, can pause to reflect on the life, work, and dreams of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the great principles of freedom, equality, and civil rights that he so nobly espoused.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, our Nation celebrated the first observance of our newest national holiday, a holiday honoring the memory of Martin Luther King, Jr. I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. King and to praise those who keep his dream of equality and brotherhood alive.

When we, in Congress, passed the resolution creating Martin Luther King Day last year, many of us spoke of Dr. King's life-long struggle for human rights. We spoke of his many awards, his receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize, his commitment to nonviolence, and his leadership of the civil rights movement.

Above all, we, in Congress, remembered Martin Luther King's vision—his dream of what America could and should be. Throughout his life, Dr. King maintained an unwavering faith in America's promise of equality and freedom. Indeed, his greatest victory was the rekindling of our Nation's commitment to the creed embodied in the Constitution: That all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with the same inalienable rights.

It was this faith Martin Luther King had in America, this dream of brotherhood, that supporters of his holiday seek to keep alive. If Monday's celebration was an important signal of progress, it was also a recognition that the struggle must go on as long as there is any bias, any hatred, any inequality in our great Nation. "Injustice anywhere," Martin Luther King said, is a threat to justice everywhere." And so we, who honor his memory, must also pledge to uphold his ideals.

As we look toward the future, as we continue our work to keep America's promise of freedom bright and Martin Luther King's dream alive, let us use our newest national holiday as a time to chart our progress. Working together for peace and justice as Dr. King did, we cannot fail.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MIKULSKI INTRODUCES MARITIME ECONOMIC AGENDA FOR 1986

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House who represent coastal cities like my own Port of Baltimore are aware of the many problems facing our Nation's ports and the U.S. maritime industry.

Since 1981, over 18,000 American seafarers have lost their jobs, a decline in that industry of almost 40 percent. In addition, longshoreman manhours and work for small maritime businesses have declined in many ports.

Because of these problems faced by our U.S. merchant marine, I am today introducing the "Maritime Economic Agenda for 1986." These three bills are initiatives which address familiar maritime problems in new, and what I believe, are more workable ways. If enacted, I believe they will create new jobs for seafarers, longshoremen, carriers and small business by promoting economic growth and opportunity within the maritime industry.

I. THE CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION ACT OF 1986

The Shipping Act of 1984 revises the Shipping Act of 1916 to provide an updated, simplified, more efficient, responsive, and effective regulatory framework for international liner shipping. The principal goal of this framework is to develop and maintain an efficient and flexible ocean transportation system through commercial means, with minimum Government involvement.

One area where the benefits of the Shipping Act are not now enjoyed, however, is in the cross-border trade. As it is now written, the Shipping Act does not allow agreements between carriers directly serving U.S. commerce through U.S. ports and those that serve that commerce by moving cargo through ports in an adjacent country. This loophole in our shipping laws is unique. Virtually all over shipping systems in the world extend the conference system to cover commerce between the host nation and a third country which moves through a country adjacent to the host nation.

What have been the effects of this loophole? First, a significant amount of cargo that should normally move through U.S. ports now moves through Canadian ports. Second, the absence of clear legal authority to form cross-border agreements has led to a deteriorating situation where unbridled, cut-throat competition could threaten the stability of our ocean transportation system, adversely affecting carriers, shippers, and ultimately consumers. And finally, and perhaps most significantly, carriers moving cargo directly through U.S. ports and those moving goods through ports in adjacent countries have been unable to take full advantage of the framework set forth in the 1984 Shipping Act.

In the past, legislation introduced to address this problem has directed at correcting the so-called "Canadian diversion" problem. These bills focused on the need for U.S. Government regulation of carriers serving U.S. commerce by moving cargo through Canadian ports. In a sense, by focusing on how Govern-

ment could solve the problem, they directed too much attention away from the Shipping Act of 1984's goal of reducing Government involvement, while increasing the efficiency of our ocean transportation system.

The bill I am introducing today, however, the Cross-Border Cooperation Act of 1986, offers us a chance to make a dramatic break with past approaches to the cross-border loophole in the Shipping Act. It recasts a solution to this problem not in terms of Government regulation, but commercial cooperation. It replaces the idea of confrontation with the notion of conciliation.

How does the Cross-Border Cooperation Act do this?

First, it would create a new category of carrier, called "contiguous carriers," under the Shipping Act of 1984. These carriers would be defined "as persons providing water transportation of passengers or cargo between the United States and a foreign country for compensation; and who use for all or part of that transportation a vessel operating between a port in a nation contiguous with the United States and a port in a foreign country other than that contiguous nation."

Second, it would allow a contiguous carrier, if he chooses, to form the kind of cooperative agreements currently permitted under section 4 of the Shipping Act with carriers serving U.S. ports.

By allowing the formation of these cross-border agreements, the bill does not seek to correct any imbalance in cross-border rate structures through Government regulation. Instead, it attempts to allow the private sector, namely carriers serving U.S. commerce through United States and Canadian ports, to come together and resolve their differences within the context of a business agreement.

This approach is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Shipping Act of 1984, while refining U.S. shipping laws to put them on a par with virtually every other nation's in the world.

II. THE MARITIME SERVICES FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1986

The second bill I am introducing is similar to legislation introduced in the two previous Congresses designed to allow many small maritime service businesses to collect on bad debts left them by foreign-owned steamship lines.

Prior to 1976, these small businesses had recourse when foreign steamship owners failed to pay their bills. They could simply file suit and U.S. marshals would seize the vessel until the courts could determine the outcome of the claim. With the passage of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act in 1976, however, suits against vessels owned or operated by a foreign government are prohibited. The result, small maritime businesses, including stevedores, marine terminal operators, port authorities, freight forwarders, drayage firms and harbor pilots, are left holding the bag.

A 1983 survey by the National Association of Stevedores put the average bad debt per stevedoring firm at \$373,000. Reports from small businessmen in my own Port of Baltimore indicate that the level of this problem is continuing, and in far too many instances, is increasing. And it is not a big waterfront cor-

porations that are forced to absorb these losses, but many family-owned firms that already operate on thin profit margins.

The Maritime Services Financial Responsibility Act of 1986 would correct this abuse by requiring the owners of foreign vessel who are in the foreign trade and use U.S. ports to obtain a certificate of financial responsibility to meet claims for maritime services. The financial responsibility required under this certificate would be equal to \$100 per ton of the vessel or \$1 million, whichever is less.

Failure to comply with the financial responsibility terms of the act would result in fines up to \$10,000 and may be subject to appropriate sanctions, including refusing departure clearance and/or access to other U.S. ports.

The bill I am introducing today makes one significant change from those measures introduced in past Congresses: it applies only to foreign vessels engaged in foreign commerce that call on ports in the United States. It does not apply to U.S. vessels engaged in the foreign commerce. This change will focus the bill's purpose, greater accountability on the part of vessel owners who refuse to pay their dockside bills, on those parties who are responsible for the problem faced by many maritime small businesses: foreign-owned steamship lines.

III. CUSTOMS AUTOMATION ACT OF 1986

The third part of the maritime package I am introducing today is the "Customs Automation Act of 1986." It is designed to aid ports in developing automated cargo processing facilities that will provide them with greatly increased capacity and efficiency to process cargo as it is loaded and unloaded at the docks.

The bill would accomplish this by earmarking 1 percent of the collected customs duties at each particular port to be returned to that port's administering authority to develop automated cargo processing facilities. Funds would be available subject to annual appropriations.

As many of my colleagues know, the U.S. Customs Service has faced sharp budget and personnel reductions in recent years that have hampered both the speed and efficiency of cargo processing at many of the Nation's ports. In many instances, manual processing of cargo only compounds this reduction in Customs personnel.

To combat these reductions and to improve the commercial performance at our Nation's ports, the Customs Service has begun to develop an automated commercial system [ACS]. The ACS is an electronically-operated cargo processing system which would enable each port to have Customs clear cargo for delivery by computer.

Funds authorized by this legislation would be designed to help U.S. ports finance the construction of the necessary facilities to participate in the ACS Program.

The establishment of a cost-sharing program between ports and Federal Government for Customs automation is both essential and cost-effective. There have been significantly increased demands on cargo processing at U.S. ports over the last decade. This fact, combined with the fiscal restraints all levels of Government face, has placed enormous strains on existing cargo processing facilities and Customs personnel. Neither the Federal

Government, nor State and local governments, can afford this cargo processing overhaul by themselves.

The cooperative partnership between the Federal Government and the States which this bill would establish would not only improve the efficiency of American ports, and increase the amount of cargo they process, but generate more Customs revenues for the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has its roots in legislation I introduced in the 97th Congress which would have established a similar "Customs Revenue Sharing Program." This legislation, however, makes several key changes embodied in that earlier measure.

First, funds authorized under this act could be used solely for a port to automate its Customs processing. As a result, the purpose of the Federal-State partnership is clearly defined and much more efficient and specific in its use of Federal funds. Second, the bill does not create an open-ended entitlement for local ports. Instead, once a port completes its automated cargo processing facilities and brings its system on line, they would no longer be able to draw upon Federal revenues.

These modifications to the previous legislation demonstrate the need for fiscal responsibility in these difficult budgetary times we face. Yet at the same time this initiative seeks to achieve a goal that each Member of the House ought to support, making our Nation's ports and maritime industry more competitive, and able to enjoy the benefits of new ideas and new technologies.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider each of the measures I am introducing today. They are designed to increase the stability and competitiveness of our domestic maritime industry, providing more jobs for small businesses, longshoremen and seafarers. In short, they are an important beginning to help create a framework for new opportunities for the U.S. merchant marine.

THE BINGHAM FAMILY EMPIRE SELF-DESTRUCTS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated that on January 10, 1986, it was announced first in the Courier-Journal, a Louisville, KY, daily newspaper, that the family of Barry Bingham, Sr., would be selling the media empire the Bingham family had accumulated during the past three generations. Typical of the one-sided news coverage of the giant Bingham media, the reporters for the Bingham media have quoted a few Kentucky leaders expressing their dismay at the decision by Barry Bingham, Sr., to sell the Courier-Journal, the Louisville Times, WHAS Radio, WHAS-TV, and the Standard Gravure, the printing company.

What the Bingham media empire will never reveal is that there are tens of thousands of Kentuckians who are overjoyed with the news that the Bingham family will soon no longer

control the news in Kentucky. Even the Associated Press headquarters in Kentucky is located on the fourth floor of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times building in downtown Louisville and is adjacent to the newsrooms of these two newspapers.

There is only one reporter for the Louisville newspapers who resides in the western half of Kentucky. Tim Roberts, who leases a small apartment in Madisonville, KY, has a telephone which serves as the "west Kentucky bureau." I emphasize Mr. Roberts is the only reporter for the Louisville newspapers who lives west of Louisville, and he moved there just last year. Even western Kentucky population centers such as Bowling Green, Owensboro, Paducah, Henderson, and Hopkinsville do not have a Courier-Journal or Louisville Times office or bureau.

In listing the bureaus of the Bingham empire the reporters understandably don't show their locations on a map of Kentucky because such would be a stark reminder that the Louisville newspapers' bureaus outside Louisville are in Frankfort, Lexington, Bardstown, Somerset, and Hazard indicate the interest of the newspapers is in Louisville, central Kentucky and eastern Kentucky.

The following is a portion of the lengthy news article written by Alex S. Jones, headlined "The Fall of the House of Bingham," which appeared in the New York Times last Sunday, January 19.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1986]

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF BINGHAM

(By Alex S. Jones)

LOUISVILLE, KY.—Sallie, now a determined feminist, emerged as a chief protagonist in the saga. Her resistance to Barry Jr.'s decision to remove her from the boards of the family businesses set in motion what became the final crisis.

At the end, even Eleanor, the younger and more conventional sister, who had tried to maintain her family ties, opposed her brother—as implacable in her way as the others.

Now that the decision to sell has been made, a number of media companies are competing to buy the Bingham properties—The Courier-Journal and Louisville Times Company, WHAS Inc., which includes a television station and two radio stations, and Standard Gravure, a commercial printing operation. They are expected to bring about \$400 million, with the families of each of Barry Sr.'s children likely to receive about \$40 million (See box).

But the family peace that Barry Bingham Sr. and his wife, Mary, hoped for seems far, far away.

THE HISTORY

"Scale the characters down, and it's definitely Faulknerian," said Robert Bingham, the 19-year-old grandson of Barry Sr., comparing his family to the tortured Mississippi delta families of William Faulkner's novels.

Just as Faulkner's fictional characters plumb the past seeking explanations for the pain of the present, the Bingham tend to look far back to pick up the threads of their undoing.

The Bingham, like the Kennedys, started poor, certainly in comparison with their present great wealth. Barry Sr.'s great-grandfather, a Scotch-Irish immigrant founded the Bingham School, a secondary school, in North Carolina shortly after the American Revolution. Barry Sr.'s great-

grandfather was also a teacher; so was his grandfather, Robert Bingham, a Confederate soldier, who returned to North Carolina after the Civil War and worked at educating freed slaves.

But Robert's son, Robert Worth Bingham, became a lawyer and moved to Louisville in 1896, at the age of 25, eventually becoming the city's mayor and a circuit court judge. He lost his first wife in 1913 when a car in which she was riding was hit by a train. Barry Sr. was seven years old when his mother died; his brother and sister not much older.

Three years later, Judge Bingham, as he was then and forever after known, married Mary Kenan Flagler, the widow of an oil tycoon with a \$100 million estate. Judge Bingham signed a pre-nuptial agreement stating that, upon her death, he would receive \$5 million from her estate. As Barry Sr. tells the story in a memo to his children, Judge Bingham insisted on the pre-nuptial agreement, even though without it he would have been entitled to half his wife's fortune.

Eight months after their wedding, the new Mrs. Bingham died, apparently of cardiac arrest. But her brothers accused Judge Bingham and her doctors of conspiring to poison her and the body was exhumed. An autopsy revealed that the cause of death was, indeed, cardiac arrest, and her brothers dropped the charges.

In 1918, Judge Bingham bought, for \$1 million, a majority interest in *The Courier-Journal* and *The Times*, which even then were Kentucky's premier newspapers. He also acquired a 40-acre estate overlooking the Ohio River, a few miles outside Louisville, and on it a huge red-brick Georgian mansion where Barry Jr. now lives. Judge Bingham christened the estate "Melcombe," after an estate in Dorset, England, where Bingham had lived since the 12th century. The judge had another house built on the estate, which, though generous, was smaller than the mansion and came to be called the "Little House." Barry Sr. and his wife Mary live there today.

The judge was an ardent Democrat and a supporter of the League of Nations, and his newspapers reflected his views. In the 1930's, he backed the New Deal and President Roosevelt rewarded him in 1933 with the ambassadorship to the Court of St. James. Judge Bingham died in London in 1937 and the next ambassador was Joseph Kennedy.

By then, Judge Bingham's younger son, Barry Sr., a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard, was deeply immersed in the family business, which had grown to include WHAS Inc.—then an AM radio station—and Standard Gravue. He alone had moved back to Louisville; his brother and sister spent most of their lives in England and Barry Sr. soon bought them out.

He was 32 years old when his father died, a handsome, garrulous and charming man with a cello voice, and he had married Mary Clifford Caperton, a Richmond girl whom he met while he was at Harvard and she at Radcliffe. The two are very close. Barry Sr. says that he decided to sell the family companies now rather than later so that he and his wife, who is 81 years old, could face the ordeal together. "It would have been almost impossible alone," he says.

In fact, Barry Sr. says that his successful marriage and the extremely close relationship with his wife somehow contributed to what he says was his clear failure to communicate effectively with his children.

Under Barry Sr., known simply as "Senior" to his employees, the family busi-

ness flourished as Louisville boomed with new industry in the post-war years and Kentucky prospered as a coal mining and tobacco center. But the *Courier-Journal* and *The Times*, in the Southern liberal political tradition, frequently supported positions that put the papers in conflict with their more conservative readers. In their columns, labor unions found strong support and strip miners were blasted for not restoring the land.

But it was the strong stand in favor of civil rights that drew the most controversy. Barry Sr. says that one of his proudest accomplishments was the Louisville had the South's first integrated school system, a victory won largely without violence—but at a price.

"I came to Louisville in 1964," said Mr. Janensch, the papers' executive editor, "and Senior was not a beloved figure then. The Bingham family were considered the liberal elite. The papers were despised as Communist. And the image of the Bingham family was that they were not at all concerned with common people. Patronizing." It was only in recent years that Barry Sr. emerged in Louisville as a popular elder statesman.

THE CHILDREN

For his children, life was very easy. The Bingham family, Sallie recalls, had five servants, including a particularly beloved nurse called Nurse by Sallie and her two older brothers, Worth and Barry Jr.

"There was no other family like it," says Sallie, who adds that she remembers a family sense of being liberals under attack; of being somehow "much better looking" than other people, and of being free of the burden of "time wasted on petty boring details." These were handled by the servants and company managers. It was a family, Sallie says, in which the highest priority was placed on an absence of friction and conflict, where troublesome details of day-to-day living simply were taken care of "like magic."

She now blames what she calls the family's "smoothness" for producing a generation of children who did not have to depend on each other, and, in the case of Sallie, Barry, Jr., and the youngest child, Eleanor, never created the close ties that often come with the give-and-take of childhood.

"We all seem to have some inhibitions about each other; it's very hard to express to each other the way we feel sometimes," Barry Sr. says, somewhat ruefully. The Bingham family, he says, might have been "much better off if we'd been a more Latin-type family with a lot of outbursts, tears, screams and reconciliations. But that has not been the way any of us operates."

The first-born of this special family was Robert Worth Bingham 3d, as handsome and garrulous as his father and clearly heir to the top spot in the family kingdom. Barry Sr. describes Worth, who was born in 1932, as a natural athlete, a natural newspaperman, a natural leader who loved mixing with politicians and other powerful figures.

He was also a reckless, profane and overbearing personality, according to Sallie and others who were close to him. He loved to take risks, as though the family's seamless lifestyle had cheated him of being tested. As a young man he delighted in fast driving and in trips to Las Vegas, where his losses sometimes forced him to make urgent calls to the non-family executives who managed the Bingham holdings, asking them to replenish his bank account and not tell his parents. He was one of the Louisville businessmen who originally syndicated Muham-

mad Ali, then a young Louisville boxer named Cassius Clay.

Worth's younger brother by 16 months was Barry Jr., a very different, less daredevil personality. Barry Sr. remembers his second son as having been "a merry little boy," thoroughly devoted to his older brother, as Barry Jr. himself confirms. Despite Barry Jr.'s near adoration, Worth teased his brother relentlessly. For instance, Barry Jr. was overweight until he went to college, and Worth delighted in introducing him as "Belly," rather than Barry.

Even so, Barry Jr. says that he was quite content to grow up in Worth's shadow. Explaining Barry Jr.'s yearningly tender feelings for his brother, Sallie says that Nurse once told her of a time when Worth and Barry were quite small and were gazing together at the night sky at Melcombe. "You can have the moon and all the other stars," Barry told his older brother, "but just let me have the evening star."

Sarah Bingham, whom the family called Sallie, was born in 1937 and was quickly recognized as the writer in the family, sending poems to her father during World War II and carefully printing them in a red leather book that he sent to her from London and that she still has.

Sallie says she always considered herself to be an outsider, a person apart from Worth and Barry, who were nearly inseparable. It was only later, she said, that she came to realize—and to resent—that she had been groomed by her parents for a supportive, woman's role, in contrast to her brothers, for whom management positions in the family business were assumed.

But as a child she grew particularly close to her father, and he to her, in part because she did not go away to prep school, as did her brothers. Night after night, Barry Sr. would read to her from the works of Dickens and Mark Twain. As a writer, "she was always very productive," he says. "She's a strong person and her feelings have been strongly expressed through the years."

The two other children, Jonathan, born in 1942, and Eleanor, in 1946, were raised almost as a second generation of children within the family. "Jonathan was probably the most brilliant intellectually of all," Barry Sr. says. A quiet child, he seemed drawn to science and medicine, while Eleanor was active, outgoing and gregarious. "She's never been the lonely, artistic person that Sallie was almost from the beginning," the father says.

In the Bingham tradition, Worth and Barry graduated from Harvard, and Sallie from Radcliffe, magna cum laude. Eleanor graduated from the University of Sussex, drawn to England as her aunt and uncle had been.

At college, Sallie had unusual success as a writer, and by 21 she had a three-book contract with Houghton-Mifflin. A novel, "After Such Knowledge," was published in 1959. In 1960, one of her short stories was selected for a collection of "Forty Best Stories From Mademoiselle," and she seemed headed for a successful writing career. She married and moved to New York, with no intention of involving herself in the family business or returning to Louisville.

Worth and Barry Jr. also were on their way. By the early 1960's Worth was working at the newspapers. Barry Jr., who had slimmed down as a rower at Harvard and in the Marines, had developed a taste for broadcasting. He had worked as a broadcast journalist for CBS and NBC, then returned

to Louisville at his father's urging to work at WHAS.

Jonathan had dropped out of Harvard and soon after, in 1964, tragedy struck—the first of the Bingham family misfortunes that draw comparisons with the Kennedy clan. Living in Louisville again, Jonathan climbed a utility pole to tap electricity into a barn at Melcombe; his intent was to illuminate a reunion of the members of his boyhood Club Scout troop. When he tried to make the connection, he was electrocuted. He was 22.

Two years later, Worth, age 34, was driving a rented car with his wife, Joan, and their two children early one morning during a vacation in Nantucket. To accommodate a surfboard, the windows of the car had been rolled down and the long surfboard protruded from both sides of the car. When Worth drove too close to a parked car, the right end of the surfboard struck the car. The surfboard, in a snapping pivot, broke Worth's neck, killing him with a sort of karate chop.

For Mary Bingham and Barry Sr., whose brother and sister had passed away in the two years between Jonathan's and Worth's deaths, the tragedies were incalculable. "There were times that I wondered if I would be able to keep on," Barry Sr. says. "Nature helps, and I drew great strength through the church." As always, he depended heart and soul on his wife.

KING HOLIDAY DEDICATED TO EDUCATION ACTIVISM

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the nation has just celebrated the first National Martin Luther King Holiday. Dr. King is not only the first black American to be honored by a national holiday, but he is the first American to be so honored who neither fought in a war nor counted military victories to his credit. He held no political office and yet this nonviolent champion of equal rights and opportunities for all was to have a profound effect on the political life of this country.

The first celebration of Martin Luther King Day presented me, and the people of my district with a unique challenge. The 12th congressional district is the 10th poorest in the Nation. The unemployment rate among our youth is over 50 percent which is exceeded by the high school dropout rate. Within this context, those of us who had remembered Dr. King were called upon to develop a program which would make his ideals and values come alive for our young people. The 12th Congressional District Martin Luther King Commission was founded to continue Dr. King's work and further the ideals which he lived and died for. The commission developed a 5-year plan for youth development and educational excellence.

The five-year plan includes the development and organization of programs on nonviolence and peace, the development of youth talent in areas such as art, the improvement of basic student skills and academic performance, the development of youth sports and recreation and an increase in parent and student involve-

ment in education. The emphasis of programs and competitions will be on the development of academic, artistic, and physical talents and abilities. Young people must be given the opportunity to develop all of their potential. The first community celebration featured student awards for essays, art, and high academic achievement by school athletes and cheerleaders.

Martin Luther King Day belongs to all Americans. He was a man of God who respected the beliefs of others. He was a ceaseless worker for peace on a global scale as well as for peace between individuals who have reacted with reflex suspicion and dislike toward one another. He was a husband and father who knew that he could not care for his own children without caring for all children.

The 5-year plan for youth development and educational excellence is being launched in the spirit of peaceful activism which was a major component of the civil rights movement led by Dr. King. The people of the 12th congressional district have resolved to take action and resolve the problems of education which plague their district. At the end of 5 years we expect to have students who display extraordinary performance in every area. We have dedicated ourselves to this effort in memory of Martin Luther King, Jr.

THE TAX BILL MAKES BAD ECONOMIC SENSE

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House of Representatives made a mistake when it passed H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1985. Economically, it will cause a severe loss of capital investment in our industrial base. Regionally, the South and Louisiana specifically, this legislation creates a tax policy which retards investment and stymies economic growth.

Before the full House debate on the tax bill, I received a letter from Mr. R.J. Sharp, vice president of South Central Bell detailing the concerns that they and their parent company, BellSouth Corp., held regarding the bill. Mr. Sharp is opposed to the bill not only from his company's standpoint, but also because of the adverse impact it would have on the economic expansion in the South. Specifically Mr. Sharp states that the repeal of the investment tax credit and the lengthening of the depreciation schedules for equipment in the capital-intensive telephone industry are just two examples why they opposed this legislation. I appreciate their comments and arguments against the committee-reported bill and I would like to include Mr. Sharp's letter in the RECORD at this point:

SOUTH CENTRAL BELL,

New Orleans, LA, December 9, 1985.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,

U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIVINGSTON: The tax reform program of this Congress began with goals of fairness and economic growth. The process of developing legislation that meets

those laudable goals is extremely difficult in balancing diverse interests and needs.

Clearly one of the important issues has been a tax policy involving capital investment and the subsequent impact of that changed policy on economic development. To those of us who reside in the fastest growing area of the nation, a tax policy that retards capital investment retards our economic growth.

Twenty-three percent of the nation's population growth over the past 5 years, or approximately one-fourth, has been in the South. Forecasts indicate a continuing strong population growth trend in the South over the next decade. Many industries and businesses that are locating in our area require new facilities and are capital intensive.

To serve this growth in population and new business opportunity, BellSouth has a major capital program of over \$2 billion per year to meet our areas growing requirements. In Louisiana, we have well over \$3 billion invested in telephone plant within the state and will spend during 1985 well over \$300 million with our construction programs. Obviously, these figures highlight the very capital intensive programs we have each year within the state. A tax policy that penalizes economic growth would have an unusual impact upon our area. BellSouth is concerned that trade offs in the current debate on tax reform may place a burden on those areas that are experiencing the greatest growth and require the greatest amount of capital development.

We support a national tax policy that continues the investment tax credit and provides for depreciation schedules that mirror competition and technological realities—both global and domestic. This policy will best serve our areas' growing economic base, meet the job needs of our growing population and assure a state of the art information-communication system for your constituents.

We hope that you will carefully consider this aspect of the tax debate as you prepare to vote on tax reform legislation. For the reasons outlined above, we respectfully request that you not support the recent tax bill approved by the Ways and Means Committee.

Yours very truly,

R.J. SHARP,
Vice President.

R.N. TRAVIS,

Assistant Vice President, Public Affairs.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1986

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress know all too well the brief and tragic history of the Ukraine. All Americans and other citizens of the free world should know the sad story of that country. On a lovely building in this city is written, "Past is prologue; study the past." By knowing what happened to that once-free country, we will come to appreciate the fact that we must work to keep our freedom. If we take it for granted, it can be taken from us. I want to commend the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for

its fine work in organizing the annual Ukrainian Independence Day celebration. This year the celebration will be held on January 23. I wish the committee success in its worthwhile efforts to mark this special occasion with a fitting program.

With their declaration of independence, Ukrainians demonstrated to the world that Moscow and Kiev represented two different nations and two different mentalities. Kiev represented the democratic concept of government based on respect for human rights and the dignity of man. Moscow represented not only totalitarianism, but also a godless force of destruction. The Ukraine, with a population of over 50 million, was the first victim of Soviet aggression.

Since the tragic Soviet occupation of that land, over 10 million Ukrainians have died in the defense of their country. Today, we in the free world pay special tribute to the brave men and women of the Ukraine who are still carrying forward, at great personal danger and sacrifice, the never ending struggle for independence, and freedom. Thanks to their unflinching bravery, the cause of human rights is being carried forward. Soviet violations of the Helsinki Final Act and the Kremlin's brutal imperialism in Afghanistan are stark reminders of the fact that the Soviet bear is still willing to crush and control its neighbors. The only policy capable of shaking the foundations of the Soviet empire is a policy motivated by the idea of individual and national liberty for all. It is this ideological weapon that the Communists fear most. Let our Government never pause in its struggle to win the independence of the Ukraine and keep Afghanistan free. With our help, the gift of freedom will be a reality for the imprisoned nations that encircle our planet.

There is also another group of people who deserve our praise. I want to pay tribute to the millions of Americans of Ukrainian descent who have given much of themselves to make America the great Nation that it is today. These hard-working citizens have toiled in farms and fields and sweated in America's industry to win a better life for future generations. Ukrainian-Americans treasure their freedom and respect the desire for freedom of others. They have not forgotten their brothers and sisters in the Ukraine who yearn for the liberty that we take for granted.

Let me again commend the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for its admirable efforts in sustaining this struggle for human freedom. In the end, the power of the human spirit will triumph over the forces of oppression.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the Democratic Council on Ethnic-Americans, whose goal is to bring traditional ethnic concerns and values to the forefront of the Democratic Party's agenda, I want to draw the

attention of my colleagues to this observance of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Today, while over 50 million people live under Soviet domination in the land once known as the Ukraine, persons of Ukrainian heritage in the United States and the free world solemnly observe the inhumanity visited upon their homeland and people throughout its history by its captors.

While the Soviet Union would have us believe that their Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a fully sovereign state with constitutional rights for its people, the truth of the matter reveals a brutal and very different reality. The Ukraine as we know it today is but a colony of Soviet Russia with little, if any, local autonomy. Its constitution notwithstanding, petitions for true independence from the U.S.S.R. would be illegal and punishable by death.

For all practical purposes, the "sovereignty" that we remember for Ukrainians on this day is but a distant memory of the proud revolution that lasted from 1917 until 1922.

Historically, while the Ukraine fended off invasions and occupations for many years before the 1917 revolution, its long-held disputes with Russia set the stage for subjugation in the modern era. When the Ukrainian National Republic declared independence in 1918, the country found itself between Russian Reds and Whites. Without the benefit of foreign aid and surrounded by hostile forces, the Ukraine was ultimately defeated in a bitter struggle that left the Bolsheviks in control. At this time the Ukraine was once again reannexed to Russia, and the stage was set for incorporation into the Soviet empire. This association of the Ukraine with Soviet Russia has only caused pain, suffering and death for millions of Ukrainians, and stands as a lasting reminder to nations around the globe that fraternity with Soviet Russia always means occupation and an end to basic dignity and human rights. Indeed, the mass murders of Ukrainians that began with the Stalin era in 1929 are perhaps the starkest reminder of the lengths to which the Soviets will go to oppress those within their grip.

Under Stalin, the political killings that marked his first years in power were accelerated with the collectivization of agriculture. Meeting with the fierce resistance that has always marked the Ukrainian spirit, Stalin decided to force matters to a final resolution. The Ukrainian crop harvest of 1932 was confiscated by the Soviets causing a famine of genocide proportions.

By the end of 1933, millions of Ukrainians had died from this artificial, manmade famine.

During World War II, Ukrainians suffered greatly and were further victimized at the war's end when Stalin again requisitioned Ukrainian grain to feed Russia.

It is not possible to estimate accurately the human toll of war, famine, and state terrorism in 20th century Ukraine. From what little data are available, we do know that at least 15 million Ukrainians were left dead, and countless perished as a direct result of Stalin's atrocities.

Despite its history of persecution, on this Ukrainian Independence Day, we celebrate the enduring Ukrainian spirit of fierce pride and resolve for the future. Despite its suffer-

ing, the Ukraine's rich cultural heritage has never succumbed to Soviet domination and terror, although individual poets and writers such as Taras Shevchenko, and Mykola Khvylovy were officially suppressed and tortured.

In like manner, the practice of religion by Christians and Jews in Ukraine has survived repeated attempts by the Soviet authorities to extinguish it.

Mr. Speaker, Ukrainian-Americans join together with the people of the Ukraine, on this day, in remembering the atrocities they have endured. But perhaps more important, on this day, their voices rise up to proclaim that a people and its religion and culture will not be ended by Communist oppression. The true spirit of freedom that so embodied the brief and glorious Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-22 is still alive and will not die. This is what we honor on this important day, and this is what I urge my colleagues to remember and observe.

IKE'S LESSON, UNLEARNED

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as the debate over how to balance the budget heats up, it is imperative that my colleagues join together to formulate a fair balance between the country's military needs and the needs of a strong, healthy economy. In his 8 years in office, President Eisenhower never stopped stressing the importance of striving for vigorous growth in the economy not burdened by a huge deficit caused by a vast defense buildup. An editorial in the January 21, 1986, issue of the New York Times titled "Ike's Lesson, Unlearned" compares Ike's spending priorities with those of the present administration. I urge my colleagues to carefully study this important message.

IKE'S LESSON, UNLEARNED

A quarter-century ago, after guiding America through eight years of peace and prosperity, President Eisenhower delivered a famous farewell address. It is best remembered for warning against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex. But Ike's valedictory centered on a more fundamental theme: balancing defense spending with the needs of a healthy economy. None of his successors has ignored that advice more than Ronald Reagan.

During the Eisenhower years the Soviet Union and China were resurgent hostile powers that probed menacingly, from Korea to Berlin, for Western weakness. Ike came under incessant pressure from Congress and the armed services to increase defense spending. But even in the near-panic over the Berlin crisis and the Soviet launching of the Sputnik satellite, he refused to let the Pentagon budget unbalance the Federal budget.

Now, instead of a vigorous Sino-Soviet alliance Mr. Reagan faces an independent China and a Soviet Union whose ideology has grown unsalable abroad and unserviceable at home. While America could not have long maintained its huge margin of nuclear superiority of the 50's, it has pushed far for-

ward in everything else that matters—most notably a healthy, innovative economy. Yet in the dream of regaining the strategic margin, Mr. Reagan has put the economy at risk. Instead of a steady and sustainable improvement in defense he has embarked on a crash buildup, financed by vast deficits.

Like Mr. Reagan, Ike viewed the Soviet Union as a ruthless adversary. But he judged endurance and an economy unburdened with deficits to be the essential response, not "emotional and transitory sacrifices." Like Mr. Reagan, he heard Edward Teller, the hydrogen-bomb maker, urge development of new kinds of nuclear weaponry. But he knew enough about weapons to impose his own judgments of military necessity. When the Air Force pressed for a nuclear-powered aircraft, Ike wondered if the next proposal would be to put wings on the liner Queen Elizabeth.

He would surely have rejected a "Star Wars" missile defense. When the Gaither Commission recommended its contemporary equivalent, a \$30 billion program of civil defense, Eisenhower turned it down flat, with his usual lecture about balance, avoidance of panic and the danger of becoming a "gar-rison state," notes Stephen Ambrose, the historian.

Ike knew the difference between national security and service rivalries. "Some day," he wrote to his friend Swede Hazlett, "there is going to be a man sitting in my present chair who has not been raised in the military services and who will have little understanding of where slashes in their estimates can be made with little or no damage. If that should happen while we still have the state of tension that now exists in the world, I shudder to think of what could happen in this country."

Mr. Reagan and Secretary of Defense Weinberger have given the armed services everything each demands, without discrimination or overall plan. In the process, Mr. Reagan has run up crushing deficits and doubled the national debt.

Mr. Reagan faces a more complex world than Ike. His deficits, defense spending and refusal to raise taxes serve his goal of reducing domestic spending. His strategic buildup has caught Soviet attention and may yet secure a significant arms agreement. But the buildup and the deficits are high-risk departures from Ike's advice. If these gambles fail, Mr. Reagan will have launched a furious renewal of both the arms race and inflation.

TRIBUTES TO MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday in Inglewood, a city I am fortunate to represent, I participated in a very moving march and ceremony to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, and his dream. The highlight of the ceremony for me was the reading by two inspired children, a 12th grader and a 5th grader, of tributes they prepared about Dr. King. These two children delivered the prize winning speeches in a competition sponsored by the Inglewood City School System.

I believe that Dr. King would have been moved and gratified, as I was, to hear those eloquent young people working today to help achieve his dream.

One of the prize-winning speeches was prepared by Jarrod Johnson, a 5th grade student who is now being taught by Mr. Richard Barter and Mrs. Susan Atkins. Ms. Georgia Klaras is the principal of the Worthington school.

Michell Shields, a senior at Morningside High School, delivered the other prize-winning speech. Ms. JoAnn Jolly Sparks serves as Michell's counselor and Jerrie Martin is the principal of Morningside High.

I insert copies of these powerful tributes to Dr. King by Jarrod and Michell in the RECORD at this point, and I urge colleagues to take the time to read them. When you do, you will be as inspired as I was in hearing them delivered.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT DELIVERED BY MICHELL SHIELDS, MORNINGSIDE HIGH SCHOOL, 12TH GRADE

Blacks have been repressed for more than 200 years. Ever since the first shipload of indentured servants sailed to the English North American colonies in 1619, all black people were titled slaves and treated as third class citizens, under the second class poor whites of course. But over the years, there have been many people to help rectify this situation of blacks. A few of the best known are: Frederick Douglass who wrote the North Star paper during the middle 1800's, telling of the injustices faced by slaves; Harriet Tubman, who helped more than 200 slaves escape during the Civil War; and Booker T. Washington, who founded the now prestigious Tuskegee Institute for blacks in 1881.

But blacks were not the only ones sympathetic to the problems faced by slaves. One of the most famous and important was our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. In 1863, President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation Act that freed the slaves. But were they free? Were they treated equally in society? Needless to say, they were not.

Blacks were not the only ones persecuted because of people's ignorance for the God-given right to be treated equal. There were the Indians, who were forced to leave the new America by the English and British, all the way through to the Jewish people in Nazi Germany during the Second World War.

Many began to wonder when would all the injustices end? Everyone has the unalienable right to be treated equally in all aspects of life. But one, a man who did not just sit around wondering, decided to get out and help the cause. He had a dream. It was a dream deeply rooted in the American dream, that one day this nation would rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, and he held these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. did have a dream. He saw the abuses of people against people as a child. As he grew older, he started realizing different parts of his dream. By the time he was a young man, he started to preach his dream to any and all who would listen, and to those who would not. Upturned noses, closed ears, and big mouths did not keep Dr. King from preaching what he had to preach.

The time of most turmoil in his life was during the 1950's and 60's, but greatly because of him, bills were passed by President Johnson's Administration. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 started the United States Civil Rights Commission to stop voter discrimina-

tion and gave the Attorney General power to go to Federal Court about any known interference with the right to vote. And the Civil Rights Act of 1960 started voting referees to help qualified voters to register and vote.

But the cause continued. On August 28, 1963, over a quarter of a million people from many nationalities, races, religions, and beliefs all came together to support the dream for all to be equal in the historical March on Washington. Miraculously to some, but unsurprisingly to others, the event did greatly affect the Kennedy Administration that was in office during that time. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed that forbid any discriminatory voting registration requirements, and also, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that charged that the state's poll tax law for voting was unconstitutional and suspended it from being used in any state.

Blacks have come a long way since the days of the back seat of the buses and separate drinking fountains, but as always, there is still a long path to be traveled. Discrimination is not on paper or signs anymore, but unfortunately, it is still in the hearts and minds of many. For some older people, discrimination is on the skin bruised; for some younger people today, discrimination is in the mind confused. Nevertheless, the dream continues to live by many means, whether it be USA for Africa and Live Aid, a variety of musicians coming together to help starving people in Africa; or concerned Americans wanting to help persecuted immigrants—the dream is still there, people helping people for a better way of life.

It does a heart good to see the concern, love, and devotion people put out everyday in causes, be it save the whales or save the world. Some say it is a fad, but faith and spirit can never go out of style. As long as we keep the faith, hope, and dream, someone will always be there for the people in the world.

Yes, the dream does live and through many ways—through music by Stevie Wonder, through religion by Reverend Jesse Jackson, and through a great man's and husband's spirit, by Coretta Scott King.

Today is a day that has been long overdue—17 years overdue since the time of Dr. King's death. Today marks the first time that Dr. King's birthday will be celebrated as a national holiday.

Yes, blacks have come a long way since 17 years ago, and many have died never knowing just how far we have come. But we still have to keep striving for the culmination of Dr. King's dream for all to be equal. Though in the end, only God Himself will be the equalizer for that. We all should try everyday to give Him a little less work to do, through patience, openmindedness, and understanding for all those who are not different from us, but the same as us, all living a dream to be equal.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF "LIVING THE DREAM" BY JARROD JOHNSON, WORTHINGTON SCHOOL, FIFTH GRADE

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a man that had a dream that one day people of all nations, races, and religion would come together as one and live as brothers sharing each other's lives, giving of themselves not just one day out of a year, but each day of their lives.

Although Dr. King died before I was born, I have heard and read a lot about him; what a great man he was to try and make * * * but he took on the responsibility himself be-

cause he knew by being a spiritual-minded man and believing and trusting in God, all things are possible.

Many times there were obstacles put in his way to discourage him but he never gave up the dream that one day all men will be treated equally—not judged by the color of their skin or by how much money a person has, but by his abilities as a man.

Many times he was put in jail, even beaten, but he never gave up because he knew someone had to try and he knew that his dream had to come through and he was going to do everything in his power with the help of God, and with the help of other people who wanted the same things that he wanted to come true. One day all men, women, and children would enjoy a life of success, joy, and happiness. This world was created not for some of the people but for all of the people.

One day they succeeded in taking his life. That's all they were able to take away from him. They were not able to take away his dream or his beliefs. No, Dr. King's death was not for nothing. Because today we children are the ones who are living the dream. We no longer have to sit in the back of the bus. We do not have to enter the back door of a restaurant. Yes, we are the ones who are benefiting from that dream. My mother sometimes sits and tells my sisters and brothers and me how it was in the old days. Before integration, blacks were separated from whites in schools, where they worked, and where they ate as well.

Now because of Dr. King's hard work and because of that dream that he gave his life for, we are living that dream. Today children of different races are free to go to schools where they want to. Because of that dream we can learn all we can and enjoy our life and live wherever we want to. Dr. King, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for not giving up on dreaming and your honest belief that your dream would and could come true.

NO IRS BIG BROTHER

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Americans pay their taxes more faithfully than perhaps the taxpayers of any other country, one reason being that most taxpayers believe their tax information is confidential. Now they are finding that it is not, that an obscure 1985 law authorizes the IRS to withhold tax refunds due to people allegedly in default on government loans.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the San Jose Mercury News points out the problems arising when the IRS is turned into a policeman.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Jan. 14, 1986]

NO IRS BIG BROTHER

Those federal deficits, that went over \$100 billion for the first time in 1982 and topped \$200 billion for the first time in 1983, led Congress to pass the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, which had absolutely no effect on the deficit, now projected at \$220 billion for 1986.

Nevertheless, hidden away in that irrelevant act was an unnoticed provision just

now coming into effect: Starting with 1985 tax returns, the Internal Revenue Service is to withhold any tax refunds due to people allegedly in default on government loans.

It is not to condone deadbeats to say that this is a lousy idea, which should never have been passed and should be dumped after a two-year trial period. The job of the IRS is to collect taxes and ensure tax compliance—not to become ex officio courts to try, convict and fine people who allegedly owe the government money on non-tax related matters.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, the IRS's new police function will be used to get at some 650,000 individuals in default on \$1.3 billion for past and present student loans to the Department of Education.

Another 100,000 people are targeted for allegedly being in default on loans from the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, Small Business Administration, Veterans Administration and Agriculture Department.

So what's wrong with using one government agency to collect for defaults to another? In our view, several things.

First of all it is interesting to note the testimony of Roscoe Egger, the IRS commissioner, in hearings last September before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Noting that a 1982 law had mandated the IRS to withhold refunds due to people allegedly delinquent in child support payments, Egger testified that IRS studies showed that people thus fined were "twice as likely to become non-filers and three times as likely to have a tax delinquency in the following year."

Thus the first thing wrong with using the IRS as a policeman is that it doesn't work. People stop filing or start filing late, costing the government money on both accounts.

That's the short, technical reason we don't like the idea. But there is a philosophical one that goes deeper.

Why did those people stop filing or start filing late?

According to Egger, it is because most taxpayers believe their tax information is confidential. To turn the IRS into a policeman "violates their trust" in the tax system. This attitude, "right or wrong," he said, "is real."

Big government is bad when it begins resembling the monolithic state envisaged by George Orwell in his classic "1984" (ironically, the year this provision was passed).

Let the IRS collect taxes. If the federal government wants to go after deadbeats, it can do so the way everybody else does it—through bill collectors and legal claims. The IRS has enough to do—and faces enough opprobrium as it is—without being turned into Big Brother.

STEPHEN BACCUS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the 17th District of Florida there resides a young man who is a remarkable example to our youth and to all of us. What he has done demonstrates not only God-given talent and ability, but his own commitment to himself, his family, and society. On January 19, 1986, Stephen Baccus graduated from the University of Miami Law School. At the age of 16 he is the

youngest person ever to graduate from law school. This latest accomplishment tops the fact that at the age of 12 he was the youngest student ever to enter New York University. At 14 he graduated with honors from the University of Miami with a bachelor of science degree in computer science and math. I expect that he will some day be the youngest Chief Justice ever.

We are all proud of Stephen and I would like to insert in the RECORD part of the text of the invitation his parents prepared for the celebration of his marvelous achievement:

We the People of the United States of America, through the infinite wisdom of our founding fathers, have been endowed with the opportunity to excel in every aspect of life. An individual needs only to aspire and persevere in order to prosper. Stephen Baccus is one such individual. Yet, the day is rare when one achieves the heights of excellence as Stephen has. Let it be known that at the age of sixteen years, Stephen has become the youngest graduate of Law School in history. A special day in Stephen's honor is therefore declared * * *.

TOWARD A NATIONAL NUTRITION MONITORING SYSTEM

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of this winter season, images of homeless and hungry people are appearing daily on television screens and in the press. The problem of hunger in this country is real. As a people, we have yet to realize its true magnitude.

Although private sources have estimated that 10 to 20 million Americans suffer from malnutrition, the number of hungry Americans cannot be found in official statistics. Until this problem is quantified, an effective remedy will not be created.

Good "nutrition" is hard to measure. The wide array of Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with nutrition confirm how important it is. But that same wide array of those involved has led to a wide variation in how different agencies approach nutrition. Data is now collected in accordance with each agency's own mission, often with little thought given to its relationship to other studies.

Until this monitoring activity can be coordinated, the true picture of America's nutritional status remains unclear. We now spend millions of taxpayers' funds in nutrition-related efforts in a wide variety of Government agencies. We have an obligation to spend that money responsibly, in a coordinated fashion.

We now have the opportunity to unify these efforts through a National Nutrition Monitoring System—now before us as H.R. 2436, titled the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985. Through this structure, information would pass in a streamlined fashion through a central body where a data base would be maintained from which policy decisions can be made.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD an editorial by Lynn Parker, senior nutritionist at the Food Research and Action Center which

appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. I urge my colleagues to consider the beneficial effect which H.R. 2436 would have on monitoring and enhancing the nutritional status of our citizens.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Nov. 26, 1985]

(By Lynn Parker)

NO NUMBERS ON HUNGRY PEOPLE

WASHINGTON.—How many Americans go hungry each day?

Nobody really knows and it's about time we found out. But so far, despite growing concern, there have been no official numbers from the government.

In 1983, then presidential counselor Edwin Meese III said about hunger in America: "I've heard a lot of anecdotal stuff but I haven't heard any authoritative figures." That's just the point.

Food-stamp rolls, emergency food program use and welfare applications strongly indicate that hunger in America has been steadily increasing over the last five years. Private studies have put figures anywhere between 10 and 20 million Americans suffering from malnutrition.

The Reagan administration's task force on hunger studied the issue for a year and came to the conclusion in 1983 that it couldn't be sure if there is widespread hunger across the nation. The task force attributed its uncertainty to the "lack of up-to-date data, [which] has made it impossible to assess whether the current nutritional status of the population has worsened over the last few years."

That's totally unacceptable in a country that can tell us how many toasters and food processors America uses each year.

Several physician and public-interest groups have conducted studies of their own on hunger in America, but these cannot be considered substitutes for continuous government monitoring of the problem.

As long as America's hungry remain uncounted, policy-makers will be able to use lack of data as an excuse for not making bold moves to combat hunger.

Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate often express frustrations about the lack of up-to-date information on the extent of hunger in our country. Some have called into question the credibility of private surveys documenting the problem.

The answer to the dilemma of not having authoritative and timely national data is a national nutrition monitoring system that would allow us to keep a watch over the nutritional problems in different sections of the country. The federal government could initiate such a system without creating any new bureaucracy simply by better coordinating the collection of nutrition information gathered by numerous government offices, from the Department of Agriculture to the Army.

The Department of Health and Human Services could take responsibility for coordinating the collection of all nutrition information and could continuously report to the Congress and the public on the nutritional problems of our population nationally, as well as by region.

The government is already doing this type of monitoring in several other areas of our national well-being: The Labor Department reports on employment, the Commerce Department reports on Gross National Product and leading economic indicators and the Centers for Disease Control reports on the incidence of illnesses.

The federal government could also provide technical and financial assistance to state and local governments in their efforts to pinpoint areas of hunger that may be overlooked even in the best national survey and use these as early-warning systems for national problems.

Congress has an opportunity this year to enact a national nutrition-monitoring plan. Reps. Buddy MacKay, D-Fla., Doug Walgren, D-Pa., George Brown, D-Cal., and Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., have introduced legislation in the House and Senate to authorize the Department of Health and Human Services to coordinate all nutrition information for the government.

The Reagan administration opposed similar legislation last year, arguing that the program would be too "cumbersome" and inefficient.

In fact, the effect would be just the opposite. A system of coordinating would streamline the bureaucracy and help states and localities work together with the federal agencies to provide Mr. Meese and others in government with "authoritative figures" on which to base their judgments.

If we put such a program of continuous monitoring into place this year, we would be in a better position to fight hunger in 1985 and prevent hunger in the future.

ANDREI SAKHAROV

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize the sixth anniversary of a terrible event—the Soviet Government's condemnation of Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Dr. Elena Bonner, to internal exile in the closed city of Gorky. This anniversary is of special concern to the Congress and the international community because it marks our sixth year without one of the world's foremost advocates for human rights.

As a member of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation which monitors compliance with the 1975 Helsinki accords on human rights, I reject the Soviets' claim that Dr. Sakharov poses a threat to their country's security. The actions by the Soviets in Dr. Sakharov's case directly contravene their legal obligations under the Helsinki Final Act.

The Soviet Government's decision to allow Dr. Bonner to seek medical care in the United States could be viewed as a gesture of good faith. But its significance was undermined by the Soviets' order that she not speak out while in our country. We must also look beyond the public relations screen provided by Dr. Bonner's temporary release to the fact that her husband remains in ill health and requires urgent medical care. The Soviet Government must be compelled to allow Dr. Sakharov to enjoy the rights and privileges which he has sought so tirelessly for others.

The Soviet Union's refusal to provide information about the health and whereabouts of Dr. Sakharov serves to emphasize that country's inadequate concern for the rights of its citizens. This is a point which the House has repeatedly recognized by unanimously passing a series of resolutions on behalf of Dr. Sak-

harov, including one which I offered in June 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to remind the Soviet Union that its temporary release of Dr. Bonner will not dilute our concern for her or her husband. I urge my colleagues to continue their campaign for the release of the Sakharovs, as well as for all Soviet prisoners of conscience.

GREAT SHIPS—FAIR PRICE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, during the weekend of January 17-18, 1986, it was my privilege to participate in the Founders' Day celebrations commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.

The guest speaker at the dinner on Friday evening was Adm. James D. Watkins, Chief of Naval Operations, and I found his remarks so meaningful that I am pleased to take this opportunity to share them with my colleagues.

Anyone who shares my concern over the future of our national defense and the quality of our military equipment will be heartened by Admiral Watkins' words, but reminded that we cannot afford to lay back on our oars, else we will lose our hard-won advantage.

The article follows:

GREAT SHIPS—FAIR PRICE

It is indeed a pleasure to share founders' day and your centennial celebration, but maybe not for the reasons you might think. You might think I was invited here tonight because Navy is the largest user of Newport News products. Or, you might think I am here tonight to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the day Dwight D. Eisenhower coined the phrase "military industrial complex," which he did in his farewell address on January 17, 1961 . . .

Actually, I was invited to speak tonight because I had a brush with Newport News by birth—long before I joined the Navy. You see, my mother's father—George Clinton Ward—knew and worked for your founder, Collis P. Huntington. Grandfather was a native of New York, where his first work was on the construction of iron bridges and in railroad engineering. Collis hired him because he had heard of his engineering skills, and made him chief engineer of the Racquette Lake Railroad in New York, which Collis owned. Collis used to brag about him so much that grandfather was hired away . . . by another Huntington, nephew Henry E., who as you know became one of the owners of Newport News upon the death of Collis in 1900.

At the turn of the century, grandfather modernized a water supply system in Ohio for Henry, who in 1905 persuaded him to move to California.

So, grandfather became the general manager of Huntington Land and Improvement Company in California. My grandfather became a close friend and confidant of Henry; in fact, my mother would chat with him for hours when he visited our family on Sunday afternoons in California. My sister, Arabella Huntington Watkins James, here with us tonight, was even named after

Henry's wife. So, the Huntington name has always been a living legend in our family, and I was honored when Ed Campbell asked me to speak on this special anniversary.

But, for another reason, this is also a homecoming of sorts . . . for Newport News shipbuilding is an important part of naval history. Seven Newport News-built warships were part of the Great White Fleet. By the outbreak of World War I, 20 percent of the Navy's total tonnage had been built by Newport News. Moreover, the history of World War II carrier operations in the Pacific is the history of Newport News ships—in great sea battles involving the carriers *Enterprise*, *Yorktown*, *Hornet*, and *Essex*.

Today, when crisis looms on the horizon, and a U.S. response is deemed prudent or necessary, it is often a Newport-News-built aircraft carrier asked to steam into harm's way on a moment's notice.

Earlier this month for example, when tensions boiled in the Mediterranean, after the tragic murder of passengers awaiting flights in Rome and Vienna, it was Newport News' own USS *Coral Sea*, 39 years young, that got the alert call. You obviously build them to last!

And, in 1981, it was USS *Nimitz*, epitome of airpower at sea, which launched aircraft to down those two foolish Libyan impediments to freedom who dared to fire the first salvo at our airplanes.

You were also in on the ground floor of submarine technology, pioneering in the business with construction of Simon Lake's earliest successfully operated submersibles in 1905. More recently, you delivered the lead ship of the USS *Los Angeles* class, the most highly-capable type of nuclear attack submarine in the world today. Seventeen of her sisters have been, or are being, built by you. I was just aboard one of your fine products, USS *Birmingham*, during a recent visit to Hawaii. Your contribution to national security for 100 years has been uniquely impressive.

Unfortunately, the world has changed since our youthful days. In 1904, a Newport-News-built ship, the battleship *Virginia*, was launched. A State holiday immediately was declared. In contrast, 75 years later, when boats of the *Los Angeles* class were launched, groups in certain cities honored with a namesake ship protested the event while others questioned the need for a strong navy, saying we should make do with less.

The need to convince all Americans just how important a navy—and a strong shipbuilding capability—are to the security of this Nation has never been greater. We must convince the misinformed of this at every misstep of their way.

Unfortunately, insofar as industrial capacity is concerned, we have not always been convincing and our time is running out. We are now down to about 25 major private yards. And, a recent study found that this number could shrink to 17 yards by decade's end if threatened reductions to proposed naval shipbuilding take place. Aggregate shipyard employment could then decline by more than 30 percent.

As we found before World War II, the task of trying to reestablish a shipbuilding industry after skilled craftsmen leave the yards and seek jobs elsewhere is both time-consuming and painful. And, time at the onset of the next conflict will not be on our side. Additionally, once shipyards are closed today and their gates locked, the most likely use for the property is development as high-rise condos and resort hotels. So, even the

land is lost. Our endangered maritime industry species is indeed on the verge of extinction. We, as a nation, so dependent on the seas for livelihood, must be concerned.

How can we avoid this? Well, for those who have sailed, you know the only thing that overcomes instability is steady forward motion. That is what we need today. In the tough media environment and close public scrutiny of the 1980's, where defense critics seem to snipe from under every rock, this will take aggressive action and cohesive leadership from all of us who care about the future of American sea power.

For our part, Navy has instituted new management rigor and business acumen in our shipbuilding practices and accounts. We have pulled the reins in on our own inefficient practices of the past, such as the generation of a seemingly endless flow of change orders after initial contract negotiations.

What has been the result of these and related efforts? Between 1982 and 1985, we took delivery of more than 80 ships. Of these, almost half were delivered early, with nearly the entire balance delivered on time . . . and below cost projections. Over the same period, all our submarines were delivered on or ahead of schedule.

Newport News shipbuilding can continue to pick up the gauntlet of progress . . . to show by action that this Nation's maritime underpinnings can remain intact. As Virginia's largest employer, as the largest privately-owned shipyard in the Western Hemisphere, and the only yard capable of building our super carriers, you have in a sense grasped the baton of shipbuilding leadership. You must set the example, and show this Nation we still need good ships, built and repaired at fair prices.

As you know, the Soviet Union is now building their first true aircraft carriers, each about the size of one of your earlier products, USS *Midway*. The first ship of this class was just launched and is expected to be underway late in this decade. Now, I can guarantee one thing . . . she will be no match for the *Teddy Roosevelt* I saw christened at your shipyard last October. No, we're not overly concerned about Soviet competition in this Newport-News-Dominated area yet. But, you must never let up on helping us keep our lead over the Soviets in carrier air capability at sea. You must continue to produce quality products of proven worth, which taxpayers can also agree have come at a fair cost to them.

One of the surest ways to put ourselves out of business would be to lose the public's trust by doing otherwise. If the Nation ever thinks we in uniform and you in industry are indifferent to cost and quality, or that we, together, are "fat cats" feasting out of a cornucopia of defense dollar largess, we will certainly lose the public's confidence and, hence, support of the Congress. What a tragedy for our Nation would then ensue. Unfortunately, we already see some signs of this, with so much criticism in the media and elsewhere. So we must work doubly hard and fast to eliminate the considerable unfairness there and to reverse negative perceptions.

So, Navy will continue to work with you to obtain the best for the American taxpayer, turning out the finest ships possible for dollars they have invested. At the same time, we know that a just profit need not be incompatible with just stewardship of the public's money. This Nation was built on fair competition and product excellence, and our economy and Nation function best

when these principles are upheld in the marketplace.

As is customary, the procrastinators club came out with their annual predictions for last year in January of this year. Naturally, every prediction was on the mark. But, we do not need to procrastinate another year in order to make our predictions for 1986. For we will surely founder again on the rocks and shoals of national neglect, as we did last decade, if we allow this Nation to think that we are wallowing in excessive profits and gross mismanagement. So, to predict and achieve the very opposite, we need but uphold the most rigorous standards so we can open ourselves to the closest scrutiny by all our citizenry.

The emphasis must remain on quality—on good ships. As never before, we need a navy built to last, built to carry our people in harm's way, win and return them home again safely. As we have all been reminded again just this week, when tensions build and crises flare, it will be Navy called to the fore, ordered to sail with the tide and bring U.S. force to bear. Our people—the best sea-going professionals in the world, bar none—deserve the best of America's technological genius. After all, our superb people and American technological genius are the two largest gems in our crown of superiority.

In 1893, your yard bid on its first naval contracts for three small gunboats. There was some protest that you lacked the experience needed to build these ships. But your young yard was awarded the contract because your bid was the best.

About those early contracts, Collis Huntington wrote, "The price seems very low and more particularly so, as you know my feeling is that every ship we build . . . should be first-class in quality. What I want to do is to have for this yard the reputation of building the best ships. So do not make any calculations on scrimping the work on any of their parts."

Yes, there were some early losses on these contracts, but the motto stuck with the yard, and you became a standout among the Nation's most important shipyards.

If Collis Huntington had not taken such tough action, even in the face of possible short-term financial loss, the heroes of *Midway* and *Coral Sea* in World War II, and of the Gulf of Sidra in 1981, would not have sailed in Newport News' products. The payback for Nation and company was worth the risk and the effort put forth.

It should now be our task to cling to the motto and continue to accept the challenge of Collis Huntington for the next hundred years. The Nation's security and your future depend on it.

Thank you, God bless, and happy birthday.

AIRPORT SECURITY ACT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the second session of the 99th Congress, the Foreign Affairs Committee will resume its intensive consideration of ways to combat international terrorism. The committee has scheduled briefings on the implementation of the International Airport Security Act, which was adopted by the Congress last summer as part

of the foreign aid bill, as well as the recently announced findings of the Vice President's Task Force on Terrorism. The committee intends to continue its oversight hearings on ways to improve international maritime security, the ongoing Anti-Terrorism Training Assistance Program to friendly countries, and finally the threat of nuclear terrorism. In addition, the committee will continue to press for greater international cooperation against terrorism by exploring the feasibility of creating an international coordinating committee and other such avenues.

In this regard, I would like to commend to my colleagues a Washington Post article by Daniel F. Kohler of the Rand Corp. His article proposes an effective way for our European allies to support the United States economic isolation of Libya. Specifically, Mr. Kohler suggests that our European allies stop providing subsidized credits to Libya, which frees up Libyan currency to train international terrorists. In my judgment this approach would be an appropriate mechanism for our European allies to begin to take effective steps to enhance international cooperation to combat the growing scourge of international terrorism. As the administration discusses with our allies ways to enhance cooperation to combat terrorism, I would encourage them to carefully review and consider Mr. Kohler's suggestion in the following article.

**A SANCTION THAT WOULD PINCH QADDAFI
STOP THE TRADE CREDITS
(By Daniel F. Kohler)**

The United States has had enough, and the president has decided to impose economic sanctions on Libya. But the effect of these sanctions is likely to be little more than symbolic, particularly in view of the fact that our European allies seem unlikely to join in this effort. Economic sanctions don't work, they argue, and besides, the United States cannot expect them to prohibit profitable business relations with Libya solely on the basis of the tenuous circumstantial evidence linking Col. Muammar Qaddafi to the murders in Vienna and Rome.

There are some minimal sanctions, however, that we could expect the European governments to agree to because they would actually benefit economically from them, even though they may not recognize or admit it.

Not all trade is profitable for Europeans. Almost 20 percent of West European exports to Libya are financed with export credits that are officially supported and subsidized by the West European governments, particularly West Germany and Great Britain. The value of such export credit subsidies to the Libyan government exceeds \$40 million to \$50 million per year. You can train a lot of terrorists for \$40 million.

The form that such subsidies take is usually a repayment guarantee to West European businesses or banks that give credit to Qaddafi. Such a guarantee affords the Libyans preferential access to West European financial markets to finance imports. With such a guarantee, Qaddafi can borrow deutschmarks in Frankfurt or pounds sterling in London at interest rates that are lower than what most West German or British firms have to pay. The outstanding balances on such guaranteed credits from West European governments to Libya have for the past four years fluctuated between \$1.2

billion and \$2 billion, which corresponds to \$350 to \$570 for every Libyan man, woman and child.

It is in the Europeans' interest to stop subsidizing the Qaddafi regime through preferential trade credits. True, discontinuing such subsidies might reduce the exports of those European firms that are in the business of providing Qaddafi with anything from management services to bombs and ammunition. Also true, the economic pinch of such a sanction is too slight to make Qaddafi wince. Libya can probably borrow from private banks even without government guarantees, albeit at a higher interest rate, or choose to offset any losses in officially supported export credits by selling more oil on the open market.

Nevertheless, a removal of Western credit subsidies might have some effect. Given that such subsidies are common practice throughout the world, and that the entire East Bloc as well as many other totalitarian regimes and dictatorships benefit from them, refusing them to Qaddafi would serve as an indication that he doesn't even qualify for that less-than-illustrious group.

Furthermore, if Qaddafi were forced to pay the risk premiums that private bankers would attach to unguaranteed loans to Libya, he would have to bear the costs of his irrational actions. Each new terrorist outrage, each additional confrontation with the United States would increase the probability of violent conflict and thus make Libya a worse credit risk in a private banker's eyes. That would lead to increases in Libya's cost of borrowing.

Finally, increased oil sales by Qaddafi could only be welcome, because they would reduce the West's energy bill. It is also difficult to imagine any action on Qaddafi's part that would be more resented by the Arab countries that currently seem to support him.

The main benefit, however, of concentrating on a removal of export subsidies as minimal sanction is that such a proposal cannot be refused by the Europeans on the same grounds as the more comprehensive sanctions requested by the Reagan administration. If removing the subsidies has no effect, then instituting the subsidies in the first place had no effect either. The relevant question becomes why the Europeans subsidize credits to the Libyans in the first place.

More important, removing the subsidies cannot be interpreted as an unwarranted intrusion into the free market by the government. Quite the contrary; it amounts to a freeing of trade between Libya and Western Europe. Any European banker who would like to lend to Qaddafi should be free to do so. Only don't expect the European taxpayer to come to his rescue if the loans are not repaid.

Admittedly, it doesn't speak highly for Western solidarity in the face of terrorism if all we ask our allies to do is stop subsidizing the countries that harbor the terrorists. However, it is certainly better to ask for and obtain a little cooperation than to ask for a lot of cooperation and be refused.

**REFORMS MISSING FROM NCAA
CONVENTION**

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA] held its annual convention. This convention was to be the one during which university presidents regained control of their athletic departments and enacted necessary reforms. Unfortunately, it appears that talk of reform is becoming ever fainter.

An article in this week's Sports Illustrated stated that the recent movement by university presidents to take control of their athletic programs is losing momentum. It pointed to the fact that matters once deemed important by the presidents were not acted upon. These matters include: assuring satisfactory academic progress, cracking down on booster clubs, correcting widespread abuses of special-admissions programs and shortening athletic seasons. The article goes on to quote a delegate as saying, "A lot of athletic directors figure they've successfully waited out the presidents. Unless the presidents fight back, NCAA reform is flat-ass dead in the water."

Of course, one could counter by saying that the NCAA did finalize proposition 48. This controversial plan establishes minimum grade-point averages and standardized test scores for incoming athletes. If an athlete fails to meet these standards, he is ineligible to compete in sports his freshman year.

Proponents of proposition 48 believe it will increase graduation rates, but I don't think that is necessarily true. There is nothing to suggest that graduation rates will increase just because some athletes are forced to sit out a year. Proposition 48 conveniently places the responsibility for the education of athletes solely at the high school level. It warns high schools that their graduates will be ineligible during their freshman year of college if they do not meet certain academic standards. It's too bad that the NCAA isn't consistent in handing out responsibility. If it was, it would hold its own member institutions accountable for the education of athletes at the collegiate level.

The heated debate over proposition 48 brought out good arguments on both sides of the issue. The fears of black educators that this policy will disproportionately affect black athletes appears to be valid. However, proposition 48 is now on the books and we should take steps to guarantee that those athletes arriving at college under the higher standards of proposition 48 will not be neglected or exploited.

In absence of such guarantees, I introduced H.R. 2620, the College Athlete Education and Protection Act. My bill is based on the premise that collegiate athletic departments are funded through tax deductible contributions of individuals. The reason these contributions are tax deductible is because they supposedly "advance education." My legislation would require institutions who take advantage of this favorable tax status to live up to

the commitment of "advancing education." Under my bill, schools failing to graduate a reasonable number of their athletes would lose their tax deductions.

This legislation fills the void created by NCAA policies. While proposition 48 requires higher standards for high schools and athletes, my bill will require the same of colleges and universities by ensuring that institutions educate their athletes.

Many have suggested that while my bill may have good intentions, it is not an area in which Congress should be involved. I strongly disagree with this assessment. I believe that Congress not only has the right, but the duty to ensure that federal tax deductions are being used in the manner in which they were intended.

The failure of the NCAA to address the problems facing intercollegiate athletics, as evidenced earlier this month, is forcing others to provide solutions.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1985, the House approved the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the constitutional governments of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands. On December 13, 1985, the Senate also passed the joint resolution approving the compact. That legislation has also now been signed by the President, and the compact will take effect in accordance with its terms and in conjunction with termination of the U.N. trusteeship.

The compact is a comprehensive government-to-government agreement. Because of the exhaustive record created in connection with congressional review of the compact, I will not take the time on this occasion to review all of its elements or implications.

However, there is one aspect of the compact which I would like to address. I am referring to section 177 of the compact and the related provisions for settlement of all claims of Marshallese citizens arising from the U.S. nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands following World War II. Upon personally reviewing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to the compact, I discovered that last minute questions were raised regarding purported "constitutional issues" which some parties may seek to raise with respect to the section 177 settlement agreement.

If the section 177 agreement is challenged in the courts, it is the view of the Department of Justice and the Department of State, whose representatives testified on the section 177 agreement during our hearings on the compact, that the United States will prevail and that the constitutionality of this agreement will be affirmed. I tend to agree with the statements on this subject made in the section-by-section analysis of the compact offered by Senator McCURE, chairman of the committee which had jurisdiction over the compact in the

Senate. In the December 13, 1985, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page S17651, Senator McCURE makes it clear that the section 177 agreement is intended by Congress to be a "full and final settlement of all nuclear effects claims." He goes on to remind us that those who are generating questions about the constitutionality of the settlement, including the espousal provisions, may be promoting protracted litigation rather than compensation for the victims.

Senator McCURE also refers to Senate and House agreement to expressly endorse the espousal provisions in section 103(g) of the resolution approving the compact. As a member of both the Foreign Affairs and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House, the two committees which had original jurisdiction over the compact and section 177 agreement in the House, I participated in the agreement to which Senator McCURE refers. I can confirm that it was the intent of Congress that the section 177 be fully implemented strictly in accordance with its terms, and that the final version of section 103(g) of the resolution represents our rejection of the earlier versions of that provision.

In response to some of the questions that have been raised I would like to make the following statements:

As Congress prepared for review of the negotiated compact, the Congressional Research Service was asked to take a critical look at the document. That study was for the purpose of raising every conceivable question—in some cases even if somewhat far-fetched or implausible—about all aspects of the compact, so that the members would be aware of all possible issues and potential problems. The CRS study done on the compact was useful, in that the document assisted the members in formulating questions that were submitted to the administration. However, it is a distortion to rely upon the CRS study of the compact without also looking at the administration's responses, as well as the transcripts of our hearings and the committee reports which also contain administration views on these matters. In the end, the Members of the Congress who were most actively involved with these issues, and I am included in that category, were satisfied that the administration had answered those questions. We came to the conclusion that the section 177 agreement is consistent with international law and U.S. constitutional practice. The fact that we recognize that courts may be asked by plaintiffs in some of the court cases to review the validity of the compact and the section 177 agreement does not alter the clear meaning of the settlement provisions or the provisions of section 103(g) of the resolution approving the compact.

There is one point that is seldom mentioned by those who purport to be concerned about the rights of the Marshallese claimants. I am referring to the fact that the percentage of people voting for the compact and the section 177 agreement was significantly higher in the atolls and islands of the Marshall Islands inhabited by claimants than it was in the Marshall Islands generally. The lawyers involved in these lawsuits visited these atolls regularly and especially just before the vote and told the people to reject the compact and the sec-

tion 177 agreement so that they could pursue their remedies in court. The choice presented to the claimants as voters was clear, and the U.N. report on the plebiscite finds that the people voted freely. The people knew exactly what their implications of their vote were, and they voted to approve the settlement as part of the compact. Again, most of the claimant groups voted to approve at a higher rate than the general population. Thus, there is no basis for the argument that the rights of the claimants were subsumed in the vote of the general population on the overall agreement. In the major population centers where claimant population is smaller, the vote for the agreement is lower than in the claimant atolls and islands. But even in the Marshall Islands as a whole the vote was decisive in favor of the compact and the section 177 settlement. This fact is too often ignored by those supposedly speaking on behalf of claimant rights.

There have been a lot of questions about the validity of espousal. The arguments we have heard questioning the espousal mechanism seem to have little connection with the factual and legal bases of the section 177 agreement. After considering the views expressed by all sides, it seems clear that when the people of the Marshall Islands, including the claimants, exercise their sovereignty through their constitutional government to enter into a settlement, and then these people, who retain their inherent sovereignty notwithstanding the fact that they are in a transition from non-self-governing status to self-government, expressly and specifically affirm that exercise of sovereignty in a free vote, then any conceivable test of international law with respect to the rights of the claimants has been met. I am referring generally to fairness and equity here. The espousal process itself is a government-to-government arrangement that is well-established and recognized under international law and U.S. practice. The Marshall Islands Government made its decision to espouse these claims, the United States recognized the authority of the Marshall Islands to make that decision within the context of its constitution and the state of affairs as the trusteeship is drawing to a close and the transition to self-government is nearly complete. The section 177 agreement meets all the legal tests I know of—and then some—by providing a tribunal for adjudication of additional claims, as well as recognizing the possibility of "changed circumstances" and future ex gratia measures. Anyone who studies the agreement, instead of listening only to the arguments of those who thrive on litigation, will recognize why Congress approved this very fair and comprehensive settlement.

LANDMARK NUMBER OF MILES PROTECTED ON THE APPA- LACHIAN TRAIL

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say how thrilled I am that a grand total of 85.2 miles of the Appa-

lachian Trail has been protected as of September 1985. As the Appalachian Trail runs directly through my district of western Maryland, I have always taken a personal interest in the acquisition of trail land. My family has spent many happy times hiking portions of Maryland's 40.5 miles. My late husband, Goodloe E. Byron, both sponsored and supported legislation to increase funding for the trail's protection during his years in the Maryland State Legislature and the U.S. Congress. I am delighted to see that his dream has nearly come true.

For the RECORD, I am including a table that outlines exactly how much land was acquired this year. I am pleased to say that these numbers indicate that, out of the Appalachian Trail's 2,096.3 miles, a total of 1,831.8 miles have been protected. That amounts to an 87 percent completion rate. I hope all of my colleagues will join with me in applauding the Appalachian Trail Conference and the National Park Service for their tremendous dedication to getting the job done.

TOTAL MILES PROTECTED BY SEPTEMBER 1985

State	NPS	State	Forest Service	Total
Maine	57.1			57.1
New Hampshire	1			1
Vermont	7.7			7.7
Massachusetts	1.9	6		2.5
Connecticut	6.5			6.5
New York				
New Jersey				
Pennsylvania	2.9			2.9
Maryland		1.0		1.0
Virginia	3.3			3.3
Virginia/West Virginia	2.3			2.3

**DR. DONALD MACDONALD
BRINGS A SPECIAL PERSPECTIVE
TO THE BATTLE AGAINST
DRUG ABUSE**

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 years since his appointment as Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Dr. Donald Macdonald, my good friend and constituent from Pinellas County, FL, has had a tremendous impact on our Nation's battle against drug abuse.

Based upon his family experiences, he has brought to the agency a special perspective to our Nation's drug and alcohol problems. His efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services have been noticed and well received and, as a result, his responsibilities have grown in his new position as Acting Assistant Secretary for Health. In this new role, Dr. Macdonald not only oversees the agency for alcohol and drug abuse, but also the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, and the Food and Drug Administration.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, I know of the high esteem my colleagues hold for his work and opinions. The New York Times, in a profile yesterday, described Dr. Macdonald's unique

qualifications and experiences which help set him apart from others. Following my remarks, I would like to include this profile because it is an example of how one man has taken his tragic experiences, learned from them, educated others, and now is in a position to directly influence Federal policy.

As a friend of Dr. Macdonald and his family for many years prior to his appointment, I have known of the fine qualities which now make him an important part of this administration. I'm pleased that in his current role, all the Nation can now benefit from his knowledge and expertise in these critical areas of public health care.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1986]

**FOUND: A WARM HEART AMONG THE
BUREAUCRATS
(By Jane Gross)**

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Donald Ian Macdonald sees no point in containing his delight when the hot line rings in his office and the caller is a member of the Cabinet.

He also cannot imagine disguising the tears that fill his eyes when he talks of his son's recovery from a drug habit or of the similar ordeals of teen-agers he used to treat as a small-town pediatrician.

In a city of starchy bureaucrats, many of them jaded and cool, Dr. Macdonald brings a sense of wonder and emotional openness that has disarmed Government types who were skeptical when President Reagan appointed him two years ago to head the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, a part of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Dr. Macdonald is now serving as Acting Assistant Secretary in charge of the department's Public Health Service, the division that oversees the drug abuse agency, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers For Disease Control and the Food and Drug Administration. And he is said to have made such a mark in Washington that he is on the "short list" of candidates for the permanent post.

"It's been a miraculous sort of life," Dr. Macdonald said one recent afternoon as he reconstructed an unlikely path that took him from an ocean-front pediatric practice in Clearwater, Fla., to a position where he is in charge of a \$10 billion budget and 40,000 employees. "I'm like a kid discovering something new all the time."

Until the early 1970's, Dr. Macdonald's life was proceeding smoothly, with his practice flourishing, his four children entering adolescence and his wife active in local Republican political affairs. Then shortly after his 40th birthday, he passed into what he describes as "my male menopause," grew a beard, ditched his coat and tie and tried his hand at sailing and painting.

It was in this self-absorbed episode, Dr. Macdonald continued, that his son Andy, then 15 years old, "got in trouble" and was taken to a psychologist who detected the boy's drug problem. Unknown to his parents, that problem had escalated to a dozen joints of marijuana a day plus alcohol.

"The psychologist said, 'I can't help you because he's stoned,'" Dr. Macdonald recalled.

Andy Macdonald, now a 21-year-old pre-law student at Emory University, spent 10 months in treatment at Straight Inc., a drug-abuse program for adolescents that has spread nationwide from its base in St. Petersburg, Fla.

Stunned by his own ignorance as a parent and physician, and impressed with the

Straight program despite periodic contentions that it is coercive, Dr. Macdonald wrote a book about drug abuse, began to concentrate on abuse among his patients and began an intensive tour of the country, lecturing on the subject.

In the process he met, and apparently impressed, Nancy Reagan, who has made drug abuse her White House mandate, and Dr. Carolton E. Turner, President Reagan's deputy assistant for drug abuse policy. They urged Dr. Macdonald's appointment to his first Federal post over the objections of those who doubted his qualifications, including Margaret M. Heckler, then Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Dr. Macdonald understood the objections to his original appointment and even agreed with his detractors that his management experience was limited, as was his background in scientific research, and that his affiliation with Straight had raised the specter that he was a zealot.

"People wondered why I wasn't angry," Dr. Macdonald said, "but everything they were saying was true."

"Now, I feel very comfortable here in having proved myself."

Dr. Macdonald, now 54 years old, brought to his job in Washington some of the lessons he had learned about drug abuse in teen-agers.

"The way to reach kids is not through their rotten behavior," he said. "A kid knows he's a bum. The way to reach a kid is to see pain, sadness, death. When you say, 'You look like you're hurting,' the response is amazing. They look at you like maybe you have something to say to them."

Parents, Dr. Macdonald says, are often harder to reach since a diagnosis of drug abuse seems to carry with it blame. The surest sign of trouble, he discovered, is a mother's response when asked when she last had a good night's sleep.

"You ask that question and they start to cry," Dr. Macdonald said, his own eyes filling at the memory. "They may have no understanding what's going on, but they know when their kid is in difficulty."

As he sits in the assistant secretary's office these days, Dr. Macdonald marvels at the nice things people are saying about him. Fred Cogan, an aide to Dr. Turner, for example, says Dr. Macdonald is a man "with no hidden agendas" and "a smile you can hear over the telephone."

When Dr. Macdonald first moved to his corner suite in the Health and Human Services building in downtown Washington, he regarded himself as "a neutral guy without aspirations," reluctant but dutiful about his temporary post. Then, he says, he felt the bubbling of ambition.

And now he is relaxed and enjoying the opportunity to hobnob with the country's leading scientists and health care experts and to carry out some pet projects, like the encouragement of programs affecting children and the recent appointment of an AID coordinator for the Public Health Service.

"One of the things I've loved seeing in Government is the balance between the amateurs and the pros," Dr. Macdonald said. "This is the way our country was started, by amateurs with high ideals and purpose."

LET'S ADD COMPONENT TO THE SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOY- MENT PROGRAM

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 99th Congress, I was joined by over 80 of my colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 1090, to add an education component to the Summer Youth Employment Program [SYEP]. Since then, I have incorporated suggestions from hearings on the bill and am re-introducing a new bill. In expanding the existing summer youth employment program this new bill will:

First, provide youth the basic academic and functional competencies,

Second, provide counseling on the connection between skills and job prospects,

Third, involve those who are behind in school in combined work experience and remedial education activities,

Fourth, develop individual remedial strategies for each young person to pursue during the school year,

Fifth, add a 90-percent hold-harmless provision to insure against shifts in allocations,

Sixth, allow those local service delivery areas under the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] to participate in this program if they so chose with incentives to do so,

Seventh, ensure that local areas can select and serve those youth in most need of remediation and,

Eighth, permit the operation of SYEP on a year around basis in those service delivery areas whose schools operate on a year around schedule so that youth are not prevented from participation based solely on the basis of what part of the year that they are in school.

This legislation requires no additional Federal dollars and is thus revenue neutral, since it requires that each private industry council [PIC] raise a limited amount of non-Federal funds (1.5 percent of the SYEP allocation) to pay for this effort. These locally raised funds would then be increased by the State from non-Federal sources or from existing Federal funds available to the State under section 202(b)(1) and (3) of JTPA and under chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

This legislation was developed in response to research findings that:

First, economically disadvantaged youth are likely to experience decay in their achievement scores during the summer;

Second, a significant portion of the difference in learning from year to year between disadvantaged and advantaged youth may occur during the summer;

Third, disadvantaged youth who are behind one grade level or more in school are at-risk of dropping out of school;

Fourth, individualized, self-paced remedial instruction is effective and the preferred approach in reversing these trends with economically disadvantaged youth, and can produce modest and lasting gains in basic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

academic and functional competency skills; and

Fifth, when achievement scores can be raised during the summer, especially for youth aged 14-15, high school dropout rates may be reduced.

MARCH 1986—NATIONAL EYE DONOR MONTH

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best gift a person can give is a gift of sight. By being an organ or tissue donor, the lives of the suffering are renewed. Thanks to medical advances and increased national awareness of the benefits of organ and tissue donation, last year more than 25,000 Americans were restored to useful vision through corneal transplants.

This procedure has a 95-percent success rate in improving sight and can only be done with donated eye tissue. The procedure helps a wide spectrum of society. In 1985, a 9-day-old infant and a 103-year-old man were given this precious gift and can see today. However, thousands more people without vision could benefit from this operation but are not being helped because of a shortage of eye donations.

A united national effort exists to eliminate this shortage. The 88 eye banks belonging to the Eye Bank Association of America are committed to the goal of having a cornea readily available for anyone suffering from corneal blindness. In 1986, the 25th Anniversary Year of the EBAA, these eye banks are intensifying their work to preserve medical standards of the highest quality, to promote organ and tissue donation, and to encourage research into the prevention and treatment of eye disease and injury.

The major barrier to the elimination of waiting lists for corneal tissue is the lack of public knowledge about organ and tissue donation. In particular, many citizens do not realize that all eye tissue is acceptable for donation, regardless of the donor's age or quality of vision. There is no substitute for human eye tissue. No synthetic cornea currently is effective. Thus eye tissue not suitable for transplant is used for research projects so valuable information can be gained to help the thousands of others with diabetes, glaucoma, retinal disease, and other eye problems.

Therefore, as we in Congress have done the last 3 years, it is fitting that we once again inform the public of the need for eye and tissue donations and encourage more Americans to become organ and tissue donors. By doing so, we designate March 1986 as "National Eye Donor Month" and call on all of our citizens to support this humanitarian cause with appropriate activity.

January 23, 1986

SILVERSTEINS CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the happy occasion of Abraham and Jeanette Silverstein's 50th wedding anniversary, which they will celebrate on Saturday, January 25, 1986.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to record here a very special day in the lives of two wonderful people. The Silversteins are truly a shining example of the institution of marriage: it is an example from which we can all profit.

The Silversteins are now enjoying their retirement in Royal Palm Beach, FL, after residing for many years in Oceanside, NY. Abraham Silverstein was a salesman and buyer in children's wear in New York, and he reached the top of his trade, earning many honors. He was elected the first president of the Fabric Sales Guild, and also served as president of the Piece Goods Buyers Association. Jeanette Silverstein was actively involved in the Oceanside community, including a stint as president of the Oceanside Jewish Center Sisterhood. The Silversteins have three daughters—Carol, Doreen, and Eve—and seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the Silversteins is a story we can all be proud of, because they are the kind of people who have made America great. I call now on all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Abraham and Jeanette Silverstein on this joyous occasion, and in wishing them many more happy years together.

WHITE HOUSE UNCONCERN FOR DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY

HON. WES WATKINS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, once again the White House has shown a total unconcern for the ramifications of international conditions on the domestic oil industry. The White House concerns are obviously more deep and compassionate for international money changers and developing countries than it is for one of the most fruitful, and revenue producing, segments of the American economy, an industry whose health is essential to national security and a thriving economy.

Mr. Larry Speakes, as reported in yesterday's Washington Post, said that falling world prices for petroleum are, and I quote, "obviously a problem . . . for all oil-exporting countries and can aggravate the problem of debtor countries." Again, Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is showing more concern for foreign interests than domestic ones, and independent domestic producers in Oklahoma.

Almost 3 years ago, on February 1, 1983, then Secretary of Treasury Donald Regan, the

budget director and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors appeared before the Appropriations Committee on which I have the honor to serve. At that time, Mr. Regan said that while a reduction in the price of crude from \$8 to \$10 a barrel would cut the rate of inflation by at least 1 percent, it would add to the gross national product by about another 1 percent. Then he said, "We might have to take extreme measures of one type or another to shore up any failing banks or what have you, because we would not want the oil price drop to precipitate a bank's crisis."

At that time, I asked Mr. Regan if he would be willing to tell the oil producers of Oklahoma, and other oil-producing States, that they can take bankruptcy and belly up like Penn Square Bank did.

Mr. Regan told me that he felt sure that many of the wells drilled in Oklahoma and many of the new wells that will be drilled in the future can be profitable at \$25 a barrel. "I see no reason why at \$25 a barrel they couldn't be profitable now," he said.

Mr. Speaker, in 1982 the average rig count for Oklahoma was 621.5. That means there was an average of 621.5 rigs exploring for oil or gas, doing workovers, or servicing producing wells. This week, Mr. Speaker, the rig count in Oklahoma is 242.

An \$8 to \$10 a barrel drop in price means that Oklahoma will lose \$88 to \$100 million in revenue. A dollar drop in crude price means Oklahoma loses \$11 million in revenue. Should the price of crude level off at \$20, which is doubtful, Oklahoma will be losing around \$6 million a month, or \$72 million annually in revenues to the State, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission reports. Federal revenues also decline.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this: When the State of Oklahoma's budget, which is a balanced budget by law submitted by the Governor, incidentally, is based on crude oil priced at \$23, and the budget is still shy a quarter of a billion dollars, what are we supposed to do?

Can Oklahoma apply to the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund? Can my independent oil producers seek relief through agencies to which, as I understand it, the American taxpayers are making possible 7.25-percent interest?

I told Mr. Regan then, I was shellshocked when he said, in essence, that bankruptcy of the domestic oil industry is good for America because it was good for consumers because of lower prices. If the wells run dry and no new ones are drilled, the consumers will have to rely on insecure and much more costly imported supplies from OPEC. Mr. Speaker, we've been down that road before. I am even further shocked that the only utterance we can get from the White House is their concern for oil-exporting countries and for debtor nations.

Mr. President, your silence concerning the record-breaking number of bankruptcies and bank closures in the oil patch is deafening.

I ask, how about the oil exporting States, Mr. Speaker, and the thousands of banks that, like Mr. Regan suggested, did not loan full value on crude reserves collateral.

Mr. Speaker, last February I was at the White House while the President pitched us for more support for his military spending. I

asked him then, and I ask him again, to endorse an import fee on crude oil and refined products, with the proceeds to retire the national deficit. The policies of this administration are not only ruining the domestic oil industry, they are also causing an unhealthy and extremely hazardous reliance on imported petroleum. Given the tenor of the Mideast * * * with madman Mu'ammar Qadhafi sitting on hair trigger in Libya, who knows what can happen. We know from history what can happen and how long it takes to get petroleum and natural gas from the ground.

The ramifications, Mr. Speaker, of further deterioration of the domestic petroleum industry can make the OPEC embargo of 1973-74 and its effects look like a Sunday school picnic.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the White House should concern itself with assuring a domestic oil industry for national security purposes than plunging into those bottomless pits where billions and billions of dollars have been spent overseas, usually to create an economy which is in direct competition to U.S. industries. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HAZEN AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN CLINICAL RESEARCH

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert into the RECORD an article from the New York Times of November 8 focusing on the seventh annual Lita Annenberg Hazen Awards for Excellence in Clinical Research, administered by the Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

The \$100,000 award is presented to a physician and his chosen research fellow, whose investigative studies have changed the medical profession's knowledge and consequent treatment of a disease. The 1985 recipient is Dr. Hugh O'Neill McDevitt of Stanford University, an immunologist and clinical investigator whose scientific achievements have had wide-ranging influence on our thinking about the interrelationships of genetics and the immune system—in particular, the genetic basis for susceptibility of individuals to specific diseases.

A new and more fundamental understanding of immunologically mediated disease processes and significant insights into their prevention have resulted from his original, precise, and scholarly experimentation. Dr. McDevitt's research is creative and his excellence as a mentor is known throughout the medical community.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 8, 1985]

TISSUE RESEARCH WINS AWARD

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

Dr. Hugh O. McDevitt of Stanford University, an expert in research on the links between human tissue types and susceptibility to disease, was named winner of the \$100,000 Lita Annenberg Hazen Award for excellence in clinical research yesterday.

The award is presented each year to a physician whose research is deemed to have "changed the medical profession's under-

standing and consequent treatment of disease." Half of each award goes to the winner; the rest is used to support work by a young medical scientist who is chosen by the award winner to join in continuing research.

Dr. McDevitt, an immunologist, was a pioneer in discovering that people who have certain tissue types have heightened susceptibility to a variety of diseases, including rheumatoid arthritis, insulin-dependent diabetes and multiple sclerosis.

"He has been responsible for many of the crucial discoveries that underlie the association between disease and the human leukocyte antigens," the award announcement said. Human leukocyte antigens, substances found on the surfaces of white blood cells, are used to define a tissue type as substances on red blood cells determine blood type.

USED IN ORGAN TRANSPLANTS

While blood types are determined mainly by the presence or absence of four substances, however, tissue types are more complex and depend on at least 80 substances on leukocytes, the white blood cells. The white cells are important in the body's immune defenses.

Antigen types first came to notice when they proved vital to matching a donor and a recipient in organ transplants. Dr. McDevitt and other scientists noticed that people who had certain leukocyte antigen profiles were more likely than others to develop certain diseases that involve malfunction of the immune system. In other cases, a person's type seemed to be associated with heightened resistance to one disease or another.

Dr. James F. Glenn, president of the Mount Sinai Medical Center, chairman of the award committee, said Dr. McDevitt was being honored for research bridging basic and clinical immunology that had "yielded significant insights into the possible prevention or cure of immunologically mediated diseases." The awards are administered by Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

Mr. Speaker, established in 1979 by Mrs. Lita Annenberg Hazen, the award is a reflection of her concern about the steady decline in the number of physicians choosing research over private practice in the United States. With the reduction of Federal funds for biomedical research, private sector funding, such as the award established by Mrs. Hazen, plays an increasingly important role in clinical investigation. We cannot underestimate the importance of cooperation between Government, industry, and the academic research communities in insuring the overall health of American scientific research during these difficult times.

We thank Mrs. Hazen for her wisdom and leadership in creating this award. We congratulate Dr. Hugh O'Neill McDevitt for his elegant research and devotion to teaching, and it gives me great pleasure to share with my colleagues my excitement about the most valuable discoveries that will come from the work made possible by Mrs. Hazen's award.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a joint resolution designating June 14, 1986, as "Baltic Freedom Day."

The purpose of this resolution is to set aside a day of remembrance for the continuing plight of the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, who have endured 46 years of foreign domination and suppression by the Soviet Union.

The United States has never recognized the illegal occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Our Nation has expressed its outrage over the brutal deportations of thousands of innocent Baltic citizens into Siberia since 1940.

This resolution reaffirms the U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet takeover of these nations and stresses our continued support of the Baltic states' desire for independence, sovereignty, and freedom.

The resolution introduced today is this body's way of reminding the free world that there are nations and people who, despite 46 years of repression, have not given up hope for freedom. This resolution asks that we in this body remember, and that the President observe Baltic Freedom Day with appropriate actions to commemorate this day. It is a small price to pay for such large principles as human rights and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join with me in cosponsoring this resolution. Let us not miss this opportunity to stand with those who still dare work and hope for freedom in the shadow of Soviet domination.

THE FIGHTING FARMERS, NEW JERSEY FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, some of the finest high school football in the Nation is played in my home State of New Jersey. The spirit of competition and the level of ability are second to none. From the hundreds of teams and thousands of players who engage in inter-scholastic football competition in New Jersey, the Group IV champion is generally recognized as the strongest team in the State. For the second consecutive year, the Fighting Farmers of Union High School emerged from the season playoffs as the No. 1 rated team in the State, according to the Star-Ledger rating system.

Under Coach Lou Rettino, Union extended its undefeated string to 22 games in capturing the State championship. This winning tradition is not new to Union High School. It has displayed similar achievements in baseball and other sports, and it has kindled a spirit of pride in the school and the community.

The discipline, hard work and desire to succeed that have inspired the players at Union

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

High School will remain with them long after their athletic abilities have waned and the headlines on the sports pages have yellowed. These are qualities that will endure for the rest of their lives.

In a competitive world where the line between winning and losing is very clear, the Union High School players experienced the exhilaration of victory and personal triumph.

They played against some of New Jersey's finest teams, and won their championship game on a field so muddy that it was hard to distinguish the players. Union High School's Farmers not only won the State championship over the opposing Montclair Mounties, but they also defeated the weather and a sea of mud. It was a game that every player will remember.

I wish to congratulate Coach Rettino, the coaching staff and players, ranging from their great running back Tony Stewart, to the substitutes who participated in many practice sessions where there were no crowds to cheer them, but only the pride of being on the team and winning. They richly deserve the No. 1 ranking as New Jersey's best high school football team.

BIRMINGHAM CELEBRATES ITS JEWISH HERITAGE

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 27, 1986, the Birmingham Historical Society will celebrate Jewish Heritage Night, highlighting the many contributions that Jewish Americans have made to the economic and cultural vitality of the city of Birmingham and Jefferson County.

Although Jews make up less than 1 percent of the total population of Birmingham, with their rich heritage and religious beliefs, they have made major contributions to the city's business and civic community.

Business and civic leadership involvement led the Jews of Birmingham to be highly active in our county, and through the years they have served with distinction on many of the city's boards, councils, and commissions.

The Jewish community in Birmingham is rich in religious heritage, with Reform Judaism dominating as the primary tradition practiced at Temple Emanu-El prior to 1889. After that time, the quickly growing number of Jews from Europe and Russia who settled in Birmingham led to the establishment of an Orthodox congregation that came to be known as K'neseeth Israel, or Assembly of Israel. Temple Beth-El, with its mix of both a modern and traditional congregation, was established in 1907 and provided Jews from all religious and cultural backgrounds the opportunity to participate in synagogue life.

As strong supporters of economic growth and community fellowship through their active participation in business, education, the arts, and philanthropy, Birmingham's Jewish citizens have greatly enriched the city and the lives of all those who live there. I would like to congratulate all those participating in "Jewish

January 23, 1986

Heritage Night," particularly the members of the Birmingham Historical Society, for their continuing recognition of the many ethnic groups and traditions that have made Birmingham the great city that it is.

IMMIGRATION REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, a front page story in today's New York Times reports that the President's Council of Economic Advisors will soon issue a report warning that proposals to punish employers of illegal aliens would have adverse effects on the Nation's economy. I ask that the article be included in the RECORD.

Most of us know that employer sanctions were a centerpiece of the immigration bill which the House passed last Congress; they will be included in the immigration reform legislation which the Senate passed in this Congress and which waits House action.

I agree with the draft report's assertion that employer sanctions are a faulted idea, but the sanctions themselves are only part of the picture.

What this news article did not discuss is the unfair burden the bill would place on the Nation's employers by charging them with the duty of policing the work force. The immigration bill pending before the House would require detailed recordkeeping by all employers—large and small, no exceptions—even if they don't come within 300 miles of an illegal alien and even if they have never hired an illegal.

I doubt that this additional Government regulation would accomplish anything other than headaches for employers and increased costs to the Immigration Service for processing all the new paperwork. Costs, I might add, that would be better spent policing our borders.

The time has come to take a look at this issue from another angle. Surely we can resolve the illegal immigration problem without burying employers, particularly those with small businesses, under an ocean of paperwork.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1986]

REAGAN'S ADVISERS SAY BILL ON ALIENS CAN HURT ECONOMY

PENALTY PROPOSAL CITED

Report says fining employers of illegal immigrants would be labor market tax

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors warns in a new report that proposals to punish employers of illegal aliens would have adverse effects on the nation's economy.

Imposing sanctions on employers for hiring illegal aliens would reduce the national output of goods and services and would impose a new labor market tax on employers, the council says in a confidential draft of its 1986 report, to be submitted to Congress in early February.

The report undermines the rationale for a comprehensive immigration bill designed to

curtail the influx of illegal aliens by imposing penalties on employers who hire them. In the past, the Reagan Administration has supported such bills, including one passed by the Senate last September and awaiting action in the House.

RESTRICTIONS ARE COSTLY

But the Council of Economic Advisers said in a draft report that restrictions on immigration like restrictions on trade, are costly to employers and to the economy as a whole.

The report estimated that it would cost employers \$1.6 billion to \$2.6 billion a year to screen job applicants and weed out illegal aliens. The council did not give the basis for this estimate, which it called conservative.

The draft report, obtained today from a White House official, said there was no firm evidence that illegal aliens displaced native-born workers from jobs in the United States. The number of jobs is not fixed, the report said, adding that alien workers contributed to an overall economic expansion whose benefits were "widely diffused," in the form of lower prices, new job opportunities and higher profits for investors.

OUTPUT SAID TO BE INCREASED

The report concluded that immigration to the United States increased total employment and output in this country as well as the per-capita income of the native-born population. Conversely, it said, employer sanctions "would reduce employment and output."

The study generally does not distinguish between legal and illegal aliens in assessing their effects on the economy. It is nearly impossible to draw such distinctions from the available evidence, which suggests that the two groups affect labor markets in similar ways, the report said.

The main function of the Council of Economic Advisers, established in 1946, is to advise the President on economic developments.

Members of Congress have not yet received or read the report, so it is difficult to gauge its impact. However, the document appears likely to impede progress on the immigration bill, which is awaiting action in the House Judiciary Committee. The bill is sponsored by Representatives Peter W. Rodino Jr. of New Jersey and Romano L. Mazzoli of Kentucky, both Democrats. The Senate bill is sponsored by Senator Alan K. Simpson, Republican of Wyoming.

The report also seems certain to strengthen the hand of critics of the legislation, including Hispanic groups and farmers who have resisted tighter controls on immigration.

Albert R. Brashear, a White House spokesman, declined to comment on the report. "We don't generally comment on documents before they are released," he said.

Other Administration officials said the report reflected the views of Beryl W. Sprinkel, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Confidential minutes of Domestic Policy Council meetings over the last six months show that Mr. Sprinkel has expressed similar views in that forum, challenging the "fundamental premises" of the Senate and House bills. But to date no member of the Reagan Administration has publicly expressed such doubts.

The Domestic Policy Council is an advisory body composed of Cabinet officers.

The draft report said that Americans who competed directly with immigrant labor might experience "job losses or wage reduc-

tions." Such losses, although "more visible than the economic gains," are outweighed by the overall increase in national output, which "increases the per capita income of the native-born U.S. population," the report said. In addition, it said, "The work of immigrants reduces the prices of domestically produced goods."

FARMERS HELPED BY ALIENS

The presence of low-skilled foreign workers in the United States "enables domestic business enterprises to produce goods profitably that would not otherwise have been produced here," the report said.

For example, it said the availability of alien workers had helped American farmers compete with their counterparts in other countries. Restricting the supply of alien farm labor would "increase the costs of farm production," it said.

In addition, the report said aliens often helped Americans perform their work more efficiently. "A scientist is more productive if there are assistants to wash the test tubes and type manuscripts," it said. "A worker with family responsibilities is more productive if there are others in the household to help with child care."

The House bill would require employers to ask all job applicants for identification documents to verify that they were United States citizens or aliens authorized to work in this country. Employers would be subject to civil penalties of \$1,000 to \$5,000 for each illegal alien hired. The Senate bill also provides for civil penalties.

COST TO EMPLOYERS ASSAILED

The economic report said: "The imposition of screening and record-keeping obligations, along with penalties for noncompliance, imposes costs on employers and employment agencies. These costs are the equivalent of a labor market tax. Such a tax falls on both legal and illegal workers. The most adverse employment effects are on workers with low skill levels, particularly on youths and minorities."

"To the extent that sanctions are effective in barring illegal aliens from employment, aggregate income and output will also be reduced," the report said.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE EXTENSION

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend trade adjustment assistance, an important program which was allowed to expire when the first session of the 99th Congress adjourned in December.

My home State of Maine has been seriously hurt by the flow of foreign imports into our country, particularly in the shoe industry. For workers who have lost their jobs as a result of foreign imports, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is a valuable source of vocational retraining, job search and relocation, and temporary financial assistance.

While the continuing resolution for fiscal 1986 extended funding for the training and job search portion of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, the weekly benefits were allowed to lapse. As a result, 458 people in Maine, and nearly 10,000 beneficiaries nation-

wide, had their weekly trade readjustment allowance [TRA] benefits cut off in December. This serious omission is one which must be corrected immediately.

Maine has made great strides in establishing programs to help dislocated shoeworkers and other dislocated workers make the difficult transition from the loss of a career to successful employment in a new field. Through counseling, education, job training, and job search assistance, Maine's dislocated workers are reentering the workplace.

However, for dislocated workers to spend time in school or other training, they need the monetary assistance provided by TRA weekly benefits. By allowing these benefits to be cut off, we fail to provide an incentive to workers to seek the assistance they need to reenter the job market. In essence, we are making the adjustment trade adjustment assistance intended to facilitate nearly unattainable.

The bill I am introducing is a simple extension. It will reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program through September 30, 1989, making weekly benefits retroactive to December 19, 1985 when they were allowed to expire. No other changes will be made by this measure.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. Supporting this program is the very least we can do to show concern for America's workers who have lost their jobs because of the importation of foreign products.

IDIOSYNCRASIES OF FALL RIVER, MA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the best, most interesting and freshest thinking journalists in Massachusetts is Bob Kerr who works for the Providence Journal. For several years now, Bob Kerr has been covering the city of Fall River. He has recently been transferred to other duties by the Journal, and one of his recent columns was a tribute to that very diverse and vibrant city. It's an excellent example of Bob Kerr's first-rate writing, and an excellent testimony as well to a great city.

The article follows:

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 6, 1986]

A GUIDE TO FALL RIVER FOR THOSE WHO LOVE ITS IDIOSYNCRASIES

(By Bob Kerr)

The question will always come, I guess. Old acquaintances from other places often ease into it with, "Fall River? That place with all the old mills on the way to the Cape? That's where you live?"

Not-so-old acquaintances with not so-distant addresses are more scathing, some times scatological, in passing judgment on my decision to live where I live.

I'm getting tired of the defense because there really shouldn't have to be one. Those who don't understand will never understand because they won't take the time to go into the rich little corners of the city and find the people who make it the wonderfully

rough-edged, warm, funny, sometimes bizarre place it is.

They'll never meet Louis Sanft, who delivers Italian cookies on Christmas Eve and whom I had the honor of watching wrap up his 200th hour of hairstyling to mark the Bicentennial.

They'll never climb to the fourth floor of the Police Athletic League, on Franklin Street, and watch Libby Medeiros, a construction worker with a lot of patience, teach kids to box and throw in a few basic lessons on matters beyond the ring.

They'll never visit the big stone house on Rock Street and be charmed off their narrow-minded pins by Florence Brigham, the lady who preserves local history with a style not to be matched.

They'll never go to Billy's Cafe for a chourico sandwich and enough atmosphere to outlive a dozen fern bars.

They'll never have a lime rickey at Main Drug.

They'll never talk to a lady who has helped clothe thousands through her incredible ability to run miles of cloth through a power sewing machine.

They'll never watch the Durfee High School basketball team win yet another state championship.

They'll never talk to the wonderful couple who run the soup kitchen in the south end.

They'll never have a kielbasa plate at the Ukrainian Club.

They'll never laugh at a BMW.

They'll never go to that madcap city hall with the highway in the basement.

They'll never settle down with morning coffee and a radio talk show and marvel at the incredible local store of inventive opinion.

They'll never hang out on North Main, near Franklin, at noontime. They'll never hear Tommy Tanous play the trumpet or tell stories.

If I had the tour concession, I'd start at Jerry's Lodgings, on North Main Street, with a few words from Jerry Lawton, proprietor and champion of the mentally ill, who has given a home to dozens of people who have nowhere else to go.

Then, I'd pass the mike to my friend, Richard Thibault, who would talk about the simple joys of freedom after years of living in a mental hospital.

After picking up the obligatory sweaters at a mill outlet, some Portuguese sweet bread at a Columbia Street bakery and a chicken pie at Plourde's Bakery, on North Main Street, the tour would move on to the Belmont Club, a three-star standout in the regional quaffing guide.

A guy named Paul would talk about the New York Giants; a guy named Tommy would evenly sprinkle insults from behind the bar; and a guy named Dan would list the sins of the news media, all in the course of three frosty rounds.

We'd hit a few gorgeous churches, swing by the house on Second Street where Lizzie Borden did or did not fillet her parents with an ax, and then stop for some Portuguese food at one of half a dozen spicy choices.

We'd go "Up The Flint," "Down North" and "Out The Globe." We'd run some red lights.

Anyone wanting to leave the bus could do so on request. But they could never get back on. Like it or leave it. But don't knock it 'til you've tried it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CREDIT CARD INTEREST RATE DISCLOSURE

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Americans are daily being deluged with offers of credit cards. For the price of a stamp, a person can return a preapproved "application" and receive a credit line, immediate cash, travel insurance, and a host of extras certain to enhance the individual's prestige—and indebtedness.

Frequently, these applications are accompanied by full-color brochures and a friendly letter from the president of the institution offering the credit. There is, unfortunately, one item that is difficult to find in the attractive advertising. That is the cost of the credit card to the consumer.

To address this problem, on January 21, I introduced H.R. 4019, the Credit Card Interest Rate and Cost Disclosure Act of 1986.

Recent hearings before the Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, of which I am a member, shed a great deal of light on the issue of credit card interest rates. Since 1981, the prime interest rate has declined to 9.5 percent. Fixed rate mortgages can now be had for under 12.5 percent. Personal loans are frequently available at a rate of less than 16 percent.

A recent Federal Reserve Board study, however, shows that credit card interest rates average 18.6 percent. Most of the largest credit card issuers have rates which exceed 19.5 percent. Thus, credit card interest rates exceed by more than 10 percent the cost of money to the financial institutions which offer them.

This year alone, Americans will pay \$6 billion in interest on their credit card accounts on top of \$3 billion they will pay in annual fees. If credit card rates were just 1½ percentage points lower—the same rate they were in 1980—consumers would save \$700 million in interest charges.

The most obvious solution to the problem of high credit card interest rates is to set a cap on them. While an attractive idea on the surface, a rate ceiling has a number of serious drawbacks.

First, credit card issuers may begin limiting the availability of credit to only the lowest risks. Many people who deserve credit might well be denied it. Grace periods for paying unpaid balances interest-free might well be eliminated.

Second, if the profitability of credit cards slips to low levels, the issuer could shift costs to other types of loans or services. Thus, consumers may not be net beneficiaries of mandatory reductions in credit card rates.

The solution to the problem of high credit card interest rates is not an arbitrary cap. The key is improved marketplace competition. But marketplace competition is strangely lacking.

Although there are thousands of banks, savings and loans, credit unions, and retailers offering credit cards, interest rates are not coming down across the board.

Competition does not work when the seller is the price setter and the consumer the price

January 23, 1986

taker. A large number of sellers does not guarantee a wide range of choices.

Lending rates are set arbitrarily by card issuers because the consumer is unable to judge with certainty the true cost of a product to compare it to similar products. Many people are unaware, for example, that all MasterCard do not carry the same rates of interest.

And many credit cards are not marketed on the basis of their cost to the consumer. The fact is that information concerning finance charges and fees is virtually hidden from view on many credit card solicitations.

In addition, most people are unaware that they pay the interest rate allowed in the State where the credit card company is located, not the rate allowed for institutions within the State in which they reside.

As the availability of credit grows in our society and the amount of consumer indebtedness grows, we must protect credit card users. An informed public is the best assurance that the marketplace will work effectively. Consumers can't make informed choices without access to all the appropriate information.

A recent survey by one of our colleagues indicated that there are financial institutions which offer credit card interest rates below the national average. I have no doubt that their interest rate is one of their prime selling points. But an institution which issued a credit card carrying a 19.8-percent rate and a large annual fee is much less likely to point with pride to the cost of its product. Unfortunately, most of this country's largest credit card issuers charge the highest fees.

The legislation I am introducing today would amend the Truth in Lending Act to require that any application or preapproved application for credit display prominently the conditions of credit. Those conditions include the annual percentage rate and finance charge, annual or other charges or fees, and whether there is an interest-free grace period. To the greatest possible extent, this information must be contained in an easy-to-read table.

Cost is but one item to consider in selecting an appropriate credit card. For some, card holder services are most important. But for the large percentage of credit card users, cost is major consideration.

Until credit card consumers become more selective and careful, there will be those who will satisfy their demand for credit, at whatever the price. We can give the consumer the tools needed to make an informed decision. This legislation will help consumers shop around for the best credit card terms they can get. It will help give the consumer a better idea of the true cost of going into debt.

OIL PRICES: A MIXED BLESSING

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all have been following the rapid decline in the price of crude oil both on the international and domestic markets. Here in the United States, as late as November of last year, the price of

west Texas intermediate crude was \$32 a barrel; now it is selling for as low as \$20 per barrel on the spot market. This is a mixed blessing. For many motorists and home heating oil customers, this may result in lower fuel prices. However, it also spells potential disaster for the economies of the oilpatch States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

This situation does not bode well for both my home State of Texas and my home city of Houston. Analysis has shown that now that oil is selling at below \$25 per barrel, every \$1 drop below that price will cost Texas 25,000 jobs and millions of dollars in lost revenue. The economy of the city of Houston has been in decline for over 3 years now. I am fearful of what a collapse in domestic oil prices could do to my city.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a story that appeared on the Associated Press newswire yesterday. It illustrates the horrific impact a large decline in crude oil prices could have on the economy of Texas and other oil-producing States.

NAIL BITING TIME FOR OIL DEPENDENT STATES

DALLAS.—The oil price plunge on the spot market has sent shivers through state officials in oil producing areas who may find themselves millions of dollars short in their state budgets.

Texas, for example, planned on oil being at \$25 a barrel this year, and each \$1 drop below that means the loss of 25,000 jobs, \$100 million in tax revenue and \$3 billion in gross state product, according to the state comptroller's office.

Oil on the spot market was trading Wednesday at less than \$21 a barrel.

"We're just getting over the shock of seeing that \$20 price on the spot market and looking with super concern at what's happening," said Tony Proffitt, tax information director in the comptroller's office.

A sustained price of \$20 on the contract, on "posted price," market, where 95 percent of the oil business in Texas takes place, could mean a "devastating" loss of \$750 million from Texas' \$22 billion biennium budget, Proffitt said Wednesday, "and \$15 would be a real deal, a real deal."

The story is the same throughout the oil-patch.

Louisiana was expecting a \$150 million budget deficit with oil at \$24 a barrel, and will lose an additional \$50 million in tax revenue for every \$1 below that, Mark Drennan, the Louisiana legislature's chief fiscal officer, told lawmakers Tuesday.

If the price continues to drop, Drennan said, more budget cuts will have to be made, and the impact will begin to be felt as early as February and March tax collections.

State economists in Alaska say every \$1 drop costs the state \$150 million in lost revenue, but recent price reductions have not substantially affected the state's economy.

And Oklahoma, which planned on an average price of \$23 a barrel, stands to lose \$33 million in tax revenue if the price drops to \$20 or below, said Gov. George Nigh, who has pledged there will be no tax increases.

The price declines were accelerated by slack demand and increased output in recent months, leaving prices 18 percent lower in one week and 35 percent since November. Analysts say prices could drop below \$20 a barrel if OPEC countries continue to aggressively chase market share.

One week ago a barrel of West Texas Intermediate, a major U.S. benchmark, cost \$25.15 on the spot market, where surplus oil is sold on demand. The spot price closed Tuesday at \$20.10. In November it has been \$32.

Officials say the drop in prices on the spot market won't immediately translate into a major decline in the oilpatch since most transactions are done on contracts.

But the spot market decline may be a bad omen, they said.

"This could be either a mild shower or a very big rain storm. The clouds are right out there," said Proffitt. "Our concern now is what happens if all this spills over onto the contract market."

Prices on the contract market are still about \$25 per barrel, Proffitt said, although Citgo Petroleum Corp. announced this week it was dropping the price it would pay for West Texas Intermediate by \$1 to \$24.50 a barrel.

Texas actually won't have to settle its state budget dilemma until the end of the current budget Aug. 31, 1987, when tax increases or budget cutbacks might have to be made to account for lost oil-related revenue.

But Royal Lyson will feel the effects next month.

Lyson, regional sales manager for the N.L. McCullough Co., an oil field service firm in Midland, the heart of western Texas' oil-rich Permian Basin, said Wednesday he has already heard from nervous customers who have decided to postpone drilling because of the price drops.

At \$20 a barrel, most independents would stop drilling and McCullough might lose 50 percent of its business, Lyson said. A price of \$15 a barrel "would probably bankrupt us."

"It's nail-biting time," he said.

Officials say the price decline's effect on unemployment in oil-producing areas is hard to gauge since unemployed workers may pack up and move to areas with more opportunity.

More than 65,000 people were employed in the Oklahoma oil and natural gas industry last December, when unemployment in the state was 7.1 percent. But Wayne Huges of the state's Employment Security Commission said officials know only that sustained decline "would definitely increase unemployment."

California has 41,000 workers in the oil business, and Texas, where December unemployment was 6.8 percent, has already absorbed declines in the energy industry, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics economist Nic Santangelo.

If the price falls to \$20 for long periods, he said, employment in Texas "goes down through the bottom."

And at \$15, "you might as well roll Texas up and put it away."

IN PRAISE OF SPAIN'S FORMAL RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, Spain formally recognized Israel. As one who actively worked to see these two nations formalize their relationship, I applaud both Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and Prime Minister

Shimon Peres for their efforts to bring about this recognition.

In many ways, Spain is very similar to Israel. Both nations have emerged as prominent international forces on the strength of their people and their traditions. Each nation has struggled to achieve and maintain democracy, and in each, political debate is lively. Such debate is more than a function of the democratic process in Israel and Spain—it is a way of life.

Since 1982, Israel has had an informal mission in Spain. The two nations have had a number of cultural, scientific, and economic contacts. The January 17 agreement is the fruition of the growing relationship between Israel and Spain.

The whole question of diplomatic ties between the two nations has also been of personal interest to me. I can trace my ancestors back to Spain, and I grew up in a neighborhood populated by Jewish immigrants. In addition, the Jewish-American and Hispanic-American communities have a solid relationship. I have a bond with both cultures. Many of the members of the congressional Hispanic caucus, which I had the pleasure of chairing for 4 years, have visited Israel. In fact, the caucus sent a letter to Prime Minister Gonzalez in 1983, asking that Spain recognize Israel. I would like to briefly quote that letter, which accurately reflects my feelings on the subject of Spain's recognition of Israel:

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Your recent election signifies a positive change for the people and government of Spain. It serves to emphasize the total emergence of Spain as a full, democratic partner in the community of nations.

As such, the political and diplomatic role of Spain has become increasingly important. We, therefore, request that your government review its present diplomatic situation with Israel. Since Spain maintains open relations with many nations regardless of their political perspective, it does not seem unreasonable to hope that your government would seriously consider having formal diplomatic relations with Israel.

The special relationship between Israel and the United States is well known, and the world is also becoming more aware of the growing influence of Spain in international affairs. Also, your country's unique heritage and geographical location put it in a position to act as a conduit between the Arab world and Israel. Any lessening of tension among these nations would be in the interest of not only the nations involved, and the United States, but of all nations dedicated to seeking peace in the Middle East.

I spoke to the Prime Minister and members of his cabinet several times about the question of diplomatic recognition of Israel. They always assured me that it would happen when the time was right. The Prime Minister is a man of his word.

Finally, as Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir of Israel said about the recognition, "We congratulate the Spanish Government, and we hope that we will be able to develop meaningful relations in the diplomatic, economic, and cultural spheres." I too congratulate the people and government of both nations. It is also my hope and belief that this is the beginning of a long and meaningful relationship between the two nations.

TRIBUTE TO ED COYLE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the retirement from active public service of Mr. Edward F. Coyle, a distinguished community leader of Burlington County, NJ, part of my First Congressional District.

Ed Coyle has served Burlington County with honor and distinction for over 60 years.

As chairman of the Riverside Democratic Committee for 25 years, Ed Coyle helped lead our party through times of depression and war, prosperity and peace.

He was a cofounder of the Riverside Franklin Delano Roosevelt Democratic Club, a community based, grassroots organization that has encouraged enthusiastic participation in the democratic process.

Ed's strong leadership has been overshadowed only by his sincere concern for people and the community of Riverside. For the last 56 years Ed has been a member of the Riverside Fire Company and served on the Riverside Sewerage Authority Board of Commissioners.

Ed also served Burlington County as its treasurer for almost a decade.

On the occasion of his retirement after 6 years of tireless, dedicated service to the Riverside Township Committee and the people of Riverside, Ed's friends are hosting a tribute on February 2, 1986, at the Knights of Columbus Hall in Delran, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues would be pleased to join me in honoring Ed Coyle for his commitment and service to Burlington County and its people.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF
DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of a great Declaration of Freedom by 1,500 Cuban exiles who loved their homeland and who today are as committed as they were at Key West, FL, in 1966 to seeing the beautiful isle of Cuba released from the tyranny of Castro. In their Declaration of Freedom, these brave individuals dedicated themselves unequivocally to continuing their fight for democracy in Cuba and their dedication to this cause is still strong. Their ideals of freedom of worship, freedom of teaching, freedom of the press, and free enterprise for all the people of Cuba are ideals which we, as Americans, strongly share. I ask, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Declaration of Freedom, signed in Key West, FL, on January 23, 1966, by 1,500 dedicated men and women who longed to return to their fatherland and to see their fatherland a free, democratic Cuba once again be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks:

The declaration follows:

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

In the City of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the Martyr Island, do say:

That on January 1st, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the 19th century, was resumed.

That those responsible for this high treason to our Fatherland and to our People are just a score of traitors who, usurping the Government of the Country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our Freedom and our Dignity, also betraying the American Hemisphere.

That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurping the Power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the People), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being or the most elementary human rights.

That in their hunger for Power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes, are trying, within Cuba, to separate the Family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth, in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

That the rule of the Law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet imperialists.

In view of the foregoing,

WE DECLARE

First: That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our Fatherland and to the ideals of the Freedom revolution which was started on October 10th, 1868.

Second: That this score of traitors who have committed treason against our Fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the Ordinary Courts of Justice of Cuba.

Third: That as the Noble Cuban People will not ever surrender, because that Nation was not born to be slaves, we, the Cuban People, hereby make the present.

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

The fundamentals of this Revolution for Freedom are:

First: God almighty, above all things, in Whom we believe as the essence of Life.

Second: The Fatherland, with all of its Laws, traditions, customs and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

Third: The Family, as the cornerstone of the Human Society.

Fourth: Human Rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

Fifth: The Law, as the foundation for the proper development of the Human Society.

Sixth: Democratic Government, with its three independent branches: Legislative, Executive and Judicial.

Seventh: Representative Democracy, through the exercise of Universal Suffrage, Periodically, Free and Secretive, as the expression of Popular Sovereignty.

Eighth: Freedom of Worship, Freedom of Teaching, Freedom of the Press and Free Enterprise.

Ninth: Private Property and Ownership, as the basic expression of Liberty.

Tenth: The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the Legitimate interests of both Labor and Capital.

Eleventh: The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of Communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

Signed and sealed in Key West, Florida, on the 23rd day of January, 1966.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, because of official business I was unavoidably absent during the vote on final passage of H.R. 2443, the Expedited Funds Availability Act. I support the legislation, and had I been present I would have voted "aye."

BILL TO CORRECT AN
INJUSTICE

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by my colleague, Mr. BARTON, introducing a bill which, I hope and trust, will draw overwhelming support from my colleagues. It concerns an issue that has been brought to the floor of this House time and time again—abortion.

Under current tax law, a parent whose child is the object of an abortion may be claimed as a dependent by that parent if the child survives; even if he only takes a single breath. This, to my mind, is a terrible and repugnant loophole in the law. It is evident that the taxpayer who chooses to abort his or her child does not want to, or feels that he or she cannot, contribute to the support of that child if it were born. How can we then allow the "dreaded complication," the brief and often painful life of an aborted baby, to become a "fringe benefit."

Though many may argue that a fetus is not alive before it is born, few would deny that abortion prevents human life, whether by ending it or preventing its inception. The parent who chooses abortion, whether for social, economic, or other reasons, does not want the child to live. The final decision was to abort. I do not believe we should degrade that child's brief life by putting a price on it.

Our proposal will prohibit a taxpayer from claiming his child who is born alive after an induced abortion, and who subsequently dies as a result, as a dependent.

Furthermore, this bill will correct another related injustice by no longer allowing a taxpayer who has intentionally killed or substantially contributed to the death of his spouse or child to claim such person as a dependent.

Finally, it will stop implicit back-door funding of abortion by prohibiting the inclusion of abortion services as deductible medical care. If we as a body and as representative of the people of the United States do not believe in supporting or promoting abortion as an acceptable method of family planning in our health care and health insurance programs, we should not subsidize it indirectly by allowing those able to pay for abortions to deduct those expenses from their taxable income.

Mr. Speaker, the Hyde amendment calls for an end to taxpayer funding of abortion in all its forms. Common sense calls for an end to these other injustices.

VILLAGE OF ROSEMONT, IL, CELEBRATES 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 20, 1986, the village of Rosemont, IL, observed 30 years of incorporation as a village: Three decades of phenomenal growth and progress that has helped Illinois become an important center of business and tourism.

The village of Rosemont is a textbook example of a spirited community working together to create a town run like our country's most successful businesses: Efficient operation, steady growth, team effort toward clearly delineated goals.

Rosemont's wide variety of operations run efficiently and profitably because of the total involvement of village residents. Through the years, each resident has contributed his or her own time and talents to the continued progress of the village.

We salute Mayor Donald E. Stephens and the people of Rosemont Village Hall: Trustees Lorraine Clemmensen, Anthony D. Esposito, Hubert Langer, Emmett Michaels, Steven Minale, and Leslie Scott; and Village Clerk Irene Kolaski. Other dedicated personnel at Rosemont Village Hall include Deputy Mayor Donald E. Stephens II, Finance Officer Ray Gold, Deputy Clerk Frances Stevens, Finance Clerk Lee Doberton, Purchasing Coordinator August Sansone, Health and License Officer Joe Rizzo, Executive Secretary Gail Stephens, Clerk Rosalie Lennstrom, and Receptionist Isabelle Seib.

At Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center, Managing Director James Freeman and Peter Lombardi, executive director of the Rosemont/O'Hare Convention Bureau, bring important, income-producing trade shows to Rosemont. With the help of Jeff Mahnke of Rosemont Catering Services, and David Houston, president/general manager of Rosemont Exposition Services, exposition manager and business travelers receive top-drawer attention.

Rosemont's Public Safety Department helps maintain order and safety for the 18,000 busi-

ness people and tourists who visit Rosemont each day. Jack Hasselberger, director and chief of patrol; Gary Hopkins, deputy director and fire chief; and Mel Ramones, captain in charge of special services, coordinate these efforts. Tom Clinger, captain in charge of patrol division and Lt. Roy Evans of the services division, lend their talents. Rosemont's considerable traffic and crowds are controlled by the Rosemont Public Safety Auxiliary Department, under Lt. Jack Geren. Vito Corriero directs a public works department that keeps Rosemont streets clean and clear for visitors.

In serving its visitors, Rosemont does not forget its residents. Rosemont is a town that reveres its senior citizens and schoolchildren. Residents enjoy a park district that provides activities for young and old throughout the year, under the leadership of Robert Thompson and Robert Koehler. Dr. Frank Tavano, superintendent of Rosemont Elementary School, heads a staff of dedicated professionals who provide Rosemont schoolchildren with the tools for tomorrow.

But Rosemont refuses to rest on its laurels. Not content with already outstanding accomplishments in business, tourism, and civics, the village of Rosemont presses on in realizing the potential of this tiny parcel of land adjacent to the world's busiest airport, O'Hare International.

Late last year, Mayor Donald Stephens and the village trustees announced a \$500 million, 100-acre redevelopment project for Rosemont.

The program includes 10 major construction projects scheduled for completion in 1987. Among these projects are nine office building, comprising 9 million square feet; four world-class hotels, a unique 7,000 linear foot skybridge system, which will be the first of its kind in the Nation to connect a major exposition center with fine hotels and parking facilities; a performing arts theatre; a 4,458-car garage; a new church; a new 12,000 square foot fire station; and a 100,000 square foot addition to the Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center. This addition will bring the Expo Center's total square footage to 450,000 square feet on two levels, making the center the 11th largest exposition facility in the Nation.

This construction further solidifies Rosemont's position as the premier location for business, meetings, and conventions, and travel. Rosemont already is home to nine of the world's most prestigious hotels; the Rosemont Horizon, a 19,000-seat sports, music, and entertainment venue; the spacious Rosemont/O'Hare Exposition Center; and the versatile meeting facility, the Rosemont/O'Hare Conference Center.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we can point to a community so alive with dreams and the vitality to reach them. We commend Mayor Donald E. Stephens and the residents of Rosemont. Their self-sufficiency and creativity is a symbol of America at its most industrious. We of the House of Representatives congratulate Rosemont for 30 years of success, and we wish them a bright future.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ALFRED B. VUOCOLO

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, a high honor has been paid to a family friend, who has been invested as a Knight of Malta. The individual I am paying tribute to is Dr. Alfred B. Vuocolo, a native of Jersey City, who received the award from His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor at ceremonies held at St. Patrick's Cathedral on Friday, January 17, 1986.

Dr. Vuocolo, age 60, retired last October, due to illness, as chief executive officer for the New Jersey State Forensic Psychiatric Hospital in Trenton.

The award is the highest layman honor in the Catholic religion and dates back to the year 1113 and was approved as a religious order, the Hospitalers of St. John by Pope Pascal II. The order principally is in hospital work and included knights, and chaplains among its members. Its headquarters have been located in Rome since 1834 with sovereign status embodied in a new constitution in 1961. Malta is still an independent country. The religious aspects of the order are subject to regulations by the Pope.

Dr. Vuocolo is being honored for his service in the mental health field, beginning in 1950, at the Menlo Park Diagnostic Center, where he was a psychiatric social worker. A few years later, at the request of Gov. Richard J. Hughes, Dr. Vuocolo planned and designed the New Jersey State Department of Corrections State Training School for Boys at Skillman, NJ, providing counseling and rehabilitation for boys ages 6 through 13 years who were involved with the criminal justice system. He served as its first director for 25 years. The boys' facility was a pilot program described "as the first and the best in the Nation" by Governor Hughes.

In 1983, at the request of Gov. Thomas H. Kean, he began planning for the new psychiatric hospital known as the Vroom Building, which houses 180 maximum security cells for the criminally insane. Groundbreaking for the \$12.5 million separate forensic facility to replace the 68-year-old Vroom Building is scheduled for this year, calling for a 100 bed, 65,000 square foot, facility located near the current Vroom Building site.

At a testimonial dinner in his honor last month, Vuocolo was praised by New Jersey Human Services Acting Commissioner Geoffrey S. Perselay, "for his contribution in bringing this facility into the forefront of state hospitals serving the mentally ill. His outstanding work treating each individual under his jurisdiction for the past 35 years with dignity and respect has truly been outstanding." More than 500 friends and officials attended the tribute.

The Jersey City resident graduated from St. Peter's Preparatory School, St. Peter's College, and received his master's degree in social work from Fordham University after serving in World War II with the U.S. Navy. He

studied for his doctorate degree at New York University.

Married to the former Marie Mosca, of west New York, they now reside in Lawrenceville, NJ, with their four children, Alfred B. Vuocolo, Jr., assistant counsel in the office of Governor Kean; Andrea, a professional artist; Robert, a CPA, and Lisa, a medical student.

The present Grand Master of the Knights of Malta is Most Eminent Highness Cardinal Angelo De Mojana di Cologna, a lawyer of Milan, who was elected for life in 1962. His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor heads the Knights of Malta in the United States. Its members, in addition to the high honor, receive a coat of arms and pledge to continue their work striving for Christian perfection and to aid those in need.

Dr. Vuocolo has lectured throughout the country and has served as president of the New Jersey Association of Social Workers.

During Dr. Vuocolo's retirement dinner he was lauded by Governor Kean who said:

... Your 35 years of selfless dedication to improving the status of the less fortunate citizens of this State, particularly children, have exemplified the highest standards of public service.

Former New York Mayor Robert Wagner and Alexander Haig, former U.S. Secretary of State, are recipients of the award.

J. Peter Grace is president of the American Association of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, and regional vice presidents are William H. Edwards, Intercontinental; Thomas P. Joyce, Midwestern; Bryan F. Smith, Southwestern; John A. Volpe, New England; Robert F. Wagner, mid-Atlantic; and David M. Walters, Southeastern.

At the solemn investiture ceremony His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Law was invested with about 100 individuals from throughout the country. For the first time, women have been vested according to His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor.

Another New Jersey resident, Patricia Q. Sheehan, who has also given her life in the area of public service as mayor of New Brunswick, as a member of the cabinet, and as New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs, was also invested as a Dame of Malta at the same time.

In addition to Commissioner Perselay, those speaking at Dr. Vuocolo's retirement dinner on December 6, 1985, at Hamilton Square, NJ, included Robert Rusciano, assistant director, division of mental health and hospitals; Albert C. Wagner, chairman, board of trustees, forensic psychiatric hospital; Dennis Lafer, acting director, division of mental health and hospitals; Gary Hilton, assistant commissioner, department of corrections; Richard H. Wilson, deputy commissioner, department of human services; with benediction by Rev. W. Iving.

All those making presentations echo the words of Commissioner Perselay, praising Dr. Vuocolo's contribution, indicating that his serving of the mentally ill has been exceptional.

During his remarks, Alfred noted that the affair was conducted on his late father's birthday, and he would have been 90 years old. Reminiscing he told the audience, and especially his 60 nieces and nephews in attendance, of the trials and tribulations of his father, who came to America alone, at the

age of 16, and raised a family of eight children and "was never on anyone's payroll."

Alfred took pride in telling the audience that his father encouraged his interest in social work indicating that "the poor and the unfortunate needed support." He indicated that the interest of his father, Vito, and his mother, Mary, for their neighbors instilled the need for the involvement of their offspring in the area of social work and community service.

There are almost 60 children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren in the Vuocolo family, with more than 75 percent being involved in the areas of child care, housing, criminal justice, mental health, nursing, law, and teaching and other public service careers.

Dr. Vuocolo's brother, Conrad, and his wife, Rosemarie, are long time family friends and members of my staff. Their brother, Salvatore, a former magistrate, was affiliated with my father, Frank J. Guarini, Sr., for many years, as an attorney at law. He was most supportive of my father, as was their late brothers, Joseph and Charles.

They introduced me to Dr. Vuocolo, who assisted me on many occasions during my career as a New Jersey State senator and as a Member of the House of Representatives in various programs in which I was involved regarding those in need, especially in the criminal justice system.

I recall how Dr. Vuocolo spoke with so much pride of his work building and directing the training school for boys at Skillman. He insisted on cottage living conditions for the boys ages 6 to 13 who already were involved in our criminal justice system and had to be provided for because of acts they committed which would have incarcerated them if they were adults.

Dr. Vuocolo assured that the training school for boys was the most modern facility, excellently staffed, and designed and operated with the principle in mind that the children needed special treatment and must be served.

During the building of the facility in Blawenburg, he insisted that classrooms, modern gymnasium facilities, libraries, comfortable living conditions were provided in order to try to save the children for reentry into community life.

One incident he told me about was when he met some opposition when his building plan called for a chapel on the State facility grounds, but he met the opposition and took pride that a religious influence of the choice of the young boys could be observed.

Alfred constantly stated that his care for the children had to provide hope for the future and his results are renowned, indeed a shining example for the entire Nation to follow.

Dr. Vuocolo gave of himself to his family, to his profession, to his God. Indeed he echoes the words of Elizabeth Bibesco who wrote in "Gifts": "Blessed are those who can give without remembering and take without forgetting."

Al Vuocolo, the best gifts you gave were:

- To your enemy, forgiveness.
- To an opponent, tolerance.
- To a friend, your heart.
- To a customer, service.
- To all men, charity.
- To every child, a good example.
- To yourself, respect.

The fact that the Knights of Malta saw fit to invest Dr. Vuocolo pleases me deeply as I know that he made a great financial sacrifice in his lifetime to serve those he loved so much. He felt it was his way of paying back, and echoed the words of one of his favorite people, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen:

Some people have a belief that every tree, when it burns, gives back the colors that went into its making, they see in the flaming logs the red of many sunsets, the purple of early dawn, the silver of moonrise and the sparkle of stars. So it is with us: what we have accepted into our hearts and made a permanent part of ourselves is given back in times of trials.

I thank His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor, Mr. Grace, and the Knights of Malta for making this proud family even prouder. I share the joy of his wife, Marie, and her mother, Jennie Mosca, their children, and his brothers and sisters, Anita, Irene, and Rosalie, who have walked with all members of their families, step by step serving God and man.

When hearing about Al's award I asked my good friend, Rev. Raymond Kupke, archivist of the Diocese of Paterson, to provide me with background on this illustrious group, and he told me of its prestigious quality and that its members made solemn promises to strive for Christian perfection, providing hospital and charitable works in more than 77 countries.

I am thankful for the special efforts and voluntarism which our Nation and world needs so badly, working for God and country.

Well done good and faithful servant.

RETIREMENT OF RICHARD K. GROULX

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, CA will celebrate the retirement of Richard K. Groulx. I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding career of one of the Nation's preeminent local labor leaders.

Dick Groulx was born in 1924 in rural New York. During the Great Depression, his father moved the family to the Midwest, seeking work as a skilled mechanic. During that time his father was a UAW activist. His labor activities led to blacklisting, causing the family to move back to New York and then on to southern California.

Dick Groulx served in the Marine Corps during the Second World War, and was discharged as a corporal. He remained in Hawaii, and began his association with organized labor by volunteering with the Culinary Workers Union.

Upon his return to the mainland Dick worked as an organizer for Oakland Teamsters 588. In 1952, he transferred to Local 29 of the Professional Employees Union and began an aggressive campaign of organizing women in small companies. By enforcing union security provisions, the working conditions of these women were improved in an era of widespread sexism and sex discrimination.

In 1956, Dick ran for the position of assistant secretary to the Central Labor Council of Alameda County. With strong support from women and minority unionists, he achieved his goal, commencing his long career as a union leader.

His longstanding commitment to integration and full civil rights for all citizens found its expression in his vigorous efforts to effectuate the merger of the CIO and AFL members and unions in 1957. Over the next decade, he used his position to forge ahead for complete integration of crafts and peoples, 10 years before the National Government started implementing its own civil rights programs.

In 1958 the council, because of the integration efforts, secured strong minority support to defeat the right to work initiative, to develop a strong COPE, to send a crew to the Selma marches, to support the first Peace marches in Alameda County and to oppose the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

When he was elected to the Central Labor Council's top position of executive secretary in 1967, Dick took his place as one of the most militant council leaders in the Nation. He helped lead the county's first successful public employee strike, expanded the COPE operation to elect pro-labor candidates and secured the council's support for the United Farm Workers, the first AFL-CIO council in the Nation to do so.

During the 40 years since he knocked on the Culinary Workers door, he has proven his dedication to working men and women everywhere. As a leader, he has had the vision to forge a cooperative relationship between his AFL-CIO council and the independent ILWU and Teamsters unions as well as to steer his own council on the most progressive course seen in the Nation. As a leader, he never believed in letting others carry the burden while he basked in the glory. His 17 arrests, most on picket lines, during his career attest to his willingness to sacrifice comfort and privilege to advance the cause of social and economic justice for all in our society.

I commend the career of Dick Groulx, and urge my colleagues to reflect on the unselfish and principled behavior that is being honored by his brothers and sisters in the union movement, and community leaders throughout the bay area, the State of California, and the Nation.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO DEA LANGLOIS-LAKEWOOD WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC STUDY CLUB "WOMAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to inform my colleagues that Dea Langlois has been selected as "Woman of the Year" by the Lakewood, CA, Women's Democratic Study Club.

A native of Wisconsin, Dea graduated from business college and moved to Washington, DC, where she worked for the Departments of Justice and Agriculture from 1941-45. In 1946

she began working for the U.S. Navy and met and married her husband, Marv.

In 1951, Dea and Marv bought their present home in Lakewood. Dea attended California State University at Long Beach and began her career in the field of education. She held positions at St. Maria Goretti Elementary, St. Bartholomew's Elementary, St. Anthony's K-12, DeMille Junior High School, and Hughes Junior High School. She retired in 1985 after 26 years of service.

In addition to her professional duties, Dea has somehow managed to find the time to devote countless hours to her community and the Democratic Party. She has been actively involved with the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, Democratic State Central Committee, California Democratic Council, numerous local, State, and national elections and many hearings and meetings relating to the Democratic Party. Additionally, she has been involved with the Long Beach Math Association, California Math Council, National Council of the Teachers of Mathematics, Teachers Association of Long Beach, California Teachers Association, and the National Education Association.

Mr. Speaker, Dea Langlois has done much over the years in helping make the Lakewood area such a special place to live and work. And her commitment to the Democratic Party has not gone unnoticed by her colleagues across the State of California. My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Dea on this special occasion and we wish her and her husband, Marv, and their daughter, Cheri, continued success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

MARYLAND DEPOSITORS FAIRNESS ACT OF 1986

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Maryland Depositors Fairness Act of 1986.

This legislation amends the IRS Code of 1954 to "defer the inclusion in gross income of interest on certain deposits which are subject to withdrawal restrictions by reason of the bankruptcy or insolvency of the financial institution" until depositors have access to such income.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents who have deposits in Maryland savings and loans have asked me to help make sure they are treated fairly by the IRS. These depositors have already suffered economic hardships because of the S&L crisis in Maryland. For them to have to pay Federal taxes on income to which they do not have access would only compound the injustice of this unfortunate situation.

The Maryland Depositors Fairness Act would simply defer payment of taxes by depositors on their interest income until the time when they are able to freely use this income.

A LATE CHRISTMAS PRESENT TO THE PLO

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, the head of the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua sent a late Christmas present to Yasir Arafat of the PLO: A letter condemning Israel and praising the PLO for their heroic struggle. Mr. Ortega also expressed his gratitude for the PLO's solidarity with Nicaragua. The purpose of the letter was ostensibly to congratulate the PLO on its 20th anniversary.

I wonder what the valuable solidarity of the PLO is for which the Nicaraguan people are supposed to be grateful. Perhaps Arafat has a return gift for Mr. Ortega in the form of tips about how to export terrorism.

This letter speaks for itself, and I am including it in the RECORD for the enlightenment of my colleagues:

NICARAGUA'S ORTEGA SENDS LETTER TO ARAFAT

[Managua Prensa Latina in Spanish to Prensa Latina Havana, Dec. 31, 1985]

[Letter sent by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega to Yasir Arafat, president of the Central Committee of the PLO; date not given]

Commander YASIR ARAFAT,
President,

Central Executive Committee, PLO.

DEAR COMMANDER: On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Armed Forces of the Palestinian national liberation struggle, I send you on behalf of the National Directorate of the FSLN and the people and Government of Nicaragua, as well as myself, our fraternal and solidarity embrace. On this historical date we would like to renew our firm solidarity and support for the Palestinian people's just struggle in favor of their inalienable rights over their occupied territories. Likewise, we want to reiterate our strong condemnation and rejection of the policy of force and intimidation exerted by Israel, in an effort to deny the heroic Palestinian people their unrenounceable right to self-determination, flagrantly violating the UN Charter and the Security Council resolutions.

Taking advantage of this memorable occasion to express gratitude for the Palestinian people's valuable solidarity and that of their legitimate representative, the PLO, I want to express our firm conviction that our peoples' just cause will prevail over the policy of force imposed on us today because of our unyielding decision to defend our legitimate rights. Receive, with our recognition of your people's heroic struggle, the fraternal greetings of Sandino's people.

Fraternally,

DANIEL ORTEGA SAAVEDRA.

RECOGNIZING JAMES VAN ZANDT

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1986

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my Pennsylvania colleagues in recognizing the Honorable James Van Zandt, who died of cancer on January 6. "Jimmy" Van Zandt served 11 terms in the House of Representatives and then as special Washington representative of the Governor of Pennsylvania until 1971. For 20 years, he served as secretary of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, where he continued to make devoted friends and contribute to the Congress and Pennsylvania.

Jimmy Van Zandt knew a lot about the defense needs of this country, starting his military career in 1917 as an apprentice seaman in the U.S. Navy and retiring as a rear admiral in 1959 in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He saw active duty in both World Wars and the Korean war. In the House, he served on the House Armed Services Committee and was the ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He served his country as a civic leader as well, holding the position of national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars three times.

We all admired his energy after his retirement and marveled at his physical strength. The House of Representatives kept him young in spirit and in body—and Jimmy made the House of Representatives a better place by contributing his spirit and energy to the community represented by the House of Representatives. We will all miss him and we all want to extend our sympathy to his family and express our appreciation for his life.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CUB SCOUT PACK 461

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church of Philadelphia for their sponsorship and support of Cub Scout Pack 461. The Scout troop will celebrate its 25th anniversary on February 2, 1986.

The Cub Scout Program provides youngsters with an avenue for community involvement, creativity, and service. Thousands of boys each year begin to become active citizens by recognizing their civic responsibility for duty and service in Cub Scout troops across America. Beyond that, the Cub Scout Program provides boys with a chance to meet other boys, plan cultural and historical outings, and participate in sport and camping activities.

Without sponsors, Scouting organizations could not exist. For this reason, I ask my colleagues to join me as I recognize the outstanding contribution the Evangelical Lutheran Church has made to the Northeast Philadel-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

phia community. For 25 years the church has offered assistance and guidance to the troop over and above providing their hall for meetings and activities. Its constant encouragement is undoubtedly a source of the troop leaders' success as educators, and the pack's achievements throughout 25 years of community involvement. By lending a hand to Cub Scout Pack 461, the Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church has enriched the larger community and provided a foundation and example for the future.

NATIONAL JAYCEE WEEK

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, as this is National Jaycee Week, I would like to recognize the accomplishments of the Jaycees in my home State of Iowa.

Over the past year they succeeded in raising nearly \$60,000 for the Muscular Dystrophy Association. They also raised money for the Kids With a Dream Program, which helps terminally ill children realize a dream. This program was founded by David Stiener, of Des Moines. He was later honored as one of the "Ten Outstanding Young Americans" for this original concept.

The Iowa Jaycees also recognize an outstanding young farmer during the month of February. This program, which originated in Shenandoah, IA, during 1951, has now become a national program for the Jaycees.

Physical fitness is another high priority of the Jaycees. Each year they sponsor a junior athletic program in which youngsters participate in an Olympic competition. The Iowa Jaycees are also credited with starting the Run, Punt, and Pass Program in the Midwest.

Besides the development of the body, the Jaycees also encourage the advancement of the mind. During the month of May the Jaycees sponsor the Young Iowans' Leadership Program. The Jaycees also sponsor substance abuse awareness programs throughout the State of Iowa.

I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Iowa Jaycees and I wish them the best of luck in the year ahead.

PRESIDENT MUST CONSULT WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ACTING ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation requiring the President to submit a more detailed report to the Congress on the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua, and request that following a thorough review of this report both Houses of Congress meet to consider a vote on whether the emergency declared in Nicaragua should be terminated.

January 23, 1986

During the past 9 months, the President has declared national emergencies in three areas, Nicaragua, South Africa, and most recently in Libya. In each case the President also imposed emergency economic sanctions, such as the trade embargo with Nicaragua.

The President acted in all three instances under the authority of the National Emergencies Act [NEA], enacted in 1976 and amended in 1985, and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act [IEEPA], enacted in 1977. These statutes were enacted in the aftermath of Watergate and sought to subject the President's use of emergency powers to strict procedural limitations. Specifically, the President is required to do two things. The President is required to consult with Congress before acting under the NEA and the IEEPA and consult regularly once the actions have been carried out. Second, the President is required to transmit reports to Congress at the time of the initial action and every 6 months thereafter.

In addition to the Presidential requirements, the Congress has the option to consider a joint resolution on whether to continue the current emergency actions.

The essence of my legislation is twofold. First of all, I would require a more detailed report from the President outlining specific areas I believe should be reported. I believe this more specific information is essential in order for Congress to understand the total picture and decide on whether a vote on this issue is warranted. Contained within my legislation is a timetable for this action.

I have introduced this bill because I do not believe the President or the Congress have fulfilled their duties concerning the original intent of the NEA and the IEEPA. I believe our President should be held accountable and the Congress must respond to this explanation.

UNITED COMMUNITY CHURCH OF GLENDALE, CA, CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the United Community Church of Glendale, which on January 26, 1986, will celebrate its 25th anniversary.

The United Community Church is one of the youngest churches in Glendale, yet it has one of the most impressive records in terms of growth. Founded in 1961 in the foothill community of La Crescenta, the basic idea behind the formation of the church was "biblical truth and patriotism."

This mixture struck a responsive chord with many people in the community, and the church grew rapidly. Soon it moved to downtown Glendale where it temporarily occupied the Tuesday Afternoon Club.

Today, it occupies a sanctuary and support buildings in Glendale that are beautiful and permanent. The centerpiece of the church complex is a splendid and unique amphitheater. Other structures of architectural note are

the Heritage Hall, the library, and the Rose Chapel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the United Community Church, its founding pastor, Dr. W.S. McBirnie, and each member of the congregation on their 25th anniversary.

REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1986

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1986, a bill which reauthorizes this Nation's rehabilitation efforts, extending them for 5 years, and making a number of modest changes in the language of this statute.

The Rehabilitation Act is very important, Mr. Speaker. It provides the mechanism by which the States and the Federal Government have maintained a successful partnership for a number of years. This partnership has worked to the benefit of our economy by providing employment-related assistance to individuals who are disabled, thereby increasing the contributions by such individuals to our economy. It also helps some persons with disabilities maintain a level of independence that adds immeasurably to the quality of their lives, and thus, enriches us all.

The Subcommittee on Select Education has held five hearings around the country and in Washington. We have heard from many witnesses, representing individuals, governments, and rehabilitation organizations. Out of these many helpful discussions have come the suggestions that are now incorporated in this proposed reauthorization bill.

I referred to the changes as "modest." Witnesses pointed out a variety of problem issues that minor statutory changes could resolve. For example, this bill modifies the definition of local agency in order to ensure that Indian organizations are included in this definition. Other examples of such modest changes would include adding a requirement that the annual report go to the Congress simultaneously with its delivery to the President and making the language gender-free.

Several management changes are also proposed in this legislation. Currently, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services consists of three units, the Office of Special Education, the Rehabilitation Service Administration, and the National Institute for Handicapped Research. The heads of these units report to the Assistant Secretary. The head of special education is appointed by the Secretary; the remaining two are appointed by the President. In this legislation all three would become secretarial level appointees to a Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretary. The changes would become effective upon a vacancy in the current slots.

Examples of other management changes include increasing the public membership of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Board, to balance an increase in the Federal agency members that occurred when HEW became HHS and DOE, and specifying that the chairman of that board is elected from the public members.

This legislation would require that the Director of the National Institute of Handicapped Research, working with the Interagency Committee, come up with recommendations for establishment of some type of agency or mechanism for ensuring the development of cost-effective production and marketing of technological devices and the efficient distribution of such to persons with disabilities.

However, there is one change that is not modest and I would be remiss in not pointing it out to my colleagues. Presently, and for some time, the Rehabilitation Act contains an 80-20 match requirement. The Federal share is 80 percent. Repeatedly, we have heard from State directors of rehabilitation agencies and from others that the system is not serving anywhere close to the true number of individuals who might be eligible for such services. It is equally clear that investment in rehabilitation is a sound investment; the returns outweigh the costs. Therefore, it is time that the States begin to take a greater role in this partnership that is so beneficial to all our citizens. I am proposing in this legislation to change the match to 75-25, and at the same time, ensure that the States' contributions do not drop below their fiscal year 1985 levels.

Finally, the bill also includes language to reauthorize the Helen Keller National Center Act for 3 years and would authorize funding for that center at current levels.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the proposed changes reflect sound policy. The Subcommittee on Select Education will soon hold hearings on this bill, and we welcome the input of everyone concerned about rehabilitation as we move to finalize this legislation in the coming months.

LEGISLATION THAT PROHIBITS THE PURCHASE OF SOVIET EN- RICHMENT SERVICES FOR UNITED STATES NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which prohibits nuclear electric power utilities in the United States from purchasing uranium enrichment services from the Soviet Union.

The United States operates a uranium enrichment program through the Department of Energy, and it is intended to be fully self-sufficient through the revenues it generates from the customers it serves. In the recent past, the demand for uranium enrichment services has been substantially reduced causing a significant retrenchment in the Government's program and the closure of one of the Government's three uranium enrichment plants in the United States.

Soviet Union sales of enrichment services to domestic utilities impair the ability of the United States to continue its uranium enrichment program, which the United States operates without a profit for the benefit of electric ratepayers.

The Soviet Union does not operate its uranium enrichment business on the principles of a free market society. They offer this enrichment services at a discount from whatever level is established as the price of enrichment services in the United States.

The Soviet Union is an unfair competitor and enrichment service sales to U.S. citizens detract from the national energy security of the United States.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.